James K. Shelley,
Independence
Mo.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/evidenceofchrist0000jjac

BL
2778
.09
1852

THE

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY;

A DEBATE

BETWEEN

ROBERT OWEN, OF NEW LANARK, SCOTLAND,

AND

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, PRESIDENT OF BETHANY COLL., VA.;

CONTAINING AN

EXAMINATION OF THE "SOCIAL SYSTEM,"

AND

ALL THE SYSTEMS OF SKEPTICISM OF ANCIENT AND MODERN TIMES.

HELD IN THE CITY OF CINCINNATI, OHIO, IN APRIL 1829.

COMPLETE IN ONE VOLUME.

What then is unbelief? 'Tis an exploit,
A strenuous enterprise. To gain it, man
Must burst through every bar of common sense,
Of common shame—magnanimously wrong!
——Who most examine, most believe;
Parts, like half sentences, confound.
Read His whole volume, Skeptic, *then* reply!—YOUNG.
O Lord of Hosts! blessed is the man that trusteth in thee!—DAVID.

FOURTH STEREOTYPED EDITION.

CINCINNATI:
PUBLISHED BY JETHRO JACKSON,
CORNER WALNUT AND EIGHTH STREETS.
1852.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1852, by
J. JACKSON,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States
for the District of Ohio.

CINCINNATI:
C. A. MORGAN & CO., STEREOTYPERS,
HAMMOND ST

INTRODUCTION.

CHRISTIANITY is a *positive institution* and has had a positive existence in the world for more than eighteen centuries. Infidelity, as opposed to Christianity, is not an institution, but a mere negation of an institution and of the facts and documents on which it is founded. It has no essential formal existence. It has no facts and documents, and, therefore, it has no proof. It merely assails Christianity but offers no substitute for it, and it has none to offer.

In defending Christianity; or in proving that it is a veritable, benevolent, and Divine institution, we have nothing to do, but to develop it—to show what it is, and, perhaps, what it is not. This can be done with most effect by showing what it has done, when perspicuously and faithfully propounded, and sincerely and cordially embraced.

When we ask, What has Christianity produced in the soil of our fallen nature? or What has Christianity done for man? we do not institute a comparison between a Christian and a hypocrite, but between a sincere Christian and a sincere Pagan; or between a sincere Christian community and a sincere infidel community. We do not institute a comparison between a half-converted Christian and a half-bred infidel. We ask for a well-developed Christian and a well-developed infidel; and will then, without debate, submit the question to a well qualified and disinterested umpire. We are willing to test the tree by its fruits. Pretended Christians and pretended infidels, or Christians clothed in the attire of infidels, or infidels attired in the garb of Christians, form no logical contrast, and come not within the purview of our premises, our reasonings, or our conclusions. This would be mere trifling, or worse than trifling, with a grave and transcendently important subject.

I have never read, nor heard a philosophic, rational, logical argument against Christianity; nor have I ever seen or heard a rational, philosophic, or logical argument in favor of any form of skepticism or infidelity. Jesus Christ was, and is, a *person;* not a thing, not a doctrine, not a theory. Infidelity is not a person, not a thing, not a theory. There may be a theory of it, but it is not a theory. It is a state of mind, an intellectual or a moral imbecility. It is a spiritual jaundice, sometimes green and sometimes black. They cannot be philosophically, logically, rationally compared. They are neither logical nor literal contrasts. The infidel is but the incarnation of a negative idea. He is absolutely but a mere negation. He stands to Christianity as darkness stands to light. Is darkness anything? Is blindness anything but the loss of sight? Is unbelief anything but the repudiation of evidence? One might as rationally load a cannon to fight against darkness as to dispatch a syllogism against a chimera.

Jesus Christ was a real person, and had personal, positive attributes. He had a real and positive character, unique, original, transcendent. It was as fixed, as positive, and as radiating, as the sun in heaven. The originality and unity of his character is all-sufficient, in the eye of educated reason, to claim for him a cordial welcome into our world, and to hail him as the supreme benefactor of our race.

To my mind, it has long been a moral demonstration, clear as the sun, that no one could have drawn a character, such as that of Jesus Christ, from all the stores of human learning, from all the resources of the human imagination. The simple character of Jesus Christ weighs more in the eyes of cultivated reason than all the miracles he ever wrought. No greater truth was ever uttered than these words: "He that has seen me has seen the Father also." No mortal ever could have said so. The wisdom, and science, and learning of the world, compared with his, was, and is, and evermore shall be, as a glimmering spark to a radiant star, as a glow-worm of the twilight in contrast with the splendors of a meridian sun. It

is only in the dark we can admire a glow-worm. We cannot see it when the sun shines. But we might as hopefully lecture to a blind man on the philosophy of light, as address the mere sensualist, the visionary, or the dogmatic simpleton on the originality, unity, transparency, beauty, grandeur of the character of Jesus Christ. An animal man will not look, and, therefore, he cannot see the light; the true light which shines in the face of the Lord Jesus Christ. He affirms that he sees, but he sees not what he affirms.

Now what has dreamy skepticism or presumptious unbelief to offer, as an apology for itself, in vindication of its position, or as a substitute for Christianity? The light of nature, the light of reason, the dictates of conscience!! What flimsy sophistry! Where is this light of nature found? And who in pagandom has eyes to see it! This light of reason, these dictates of conscience, where are they found? Show me, produce me one example of the power of this light of nature, this light of reason, these dictates of conscience! Show me this eye of reason with this light of nature, working faith in God; working out Christian civilization, refinement of manners, temperance, justice, public virtue, and humanity; to say nothing of piety and the love and admiration of the purity of God! and I will lend a willing ear to such a demonstration. But the annals of the world and the experience of the present generation afford no such spectacles.

I am told of the wisdom and civilization, and of the moral virtues of a Solon, a Pythagoras, a Socrates, a Plato, a Xenophon, an Aristotle, a Zeno, a Seneca, etc. I also know something about them, and of the schools in which they were brought up, the schools which they founded, and the lives which they led. I will not "draw their frailties from their dread abode."

But they were educated men. In what schools of tradition were they brought up? *They received instruction.* They did not create it. The glimmering, flickering lamp, which gave them light, was kindled by radiations from a fire that God kindled on Mount Sinai, in Arabia, from a mystic lamp

that shone in a tabernacle pitched by Moses in the desert, and from a temple which Solomon the Wise raised in Jerusalem. Sinai is older than Athens or Parnassus; and Mount Zion than Mars-hill. Moses was born more than a thousand years before Pythagoras, Solon, Socrates, Plato, Xenophon, Zeno, or Seneca. Some of these were cotemporaries of the Jewish prophets. But Abraham, Isaac, Jacob antedate them all more than fifteen hundred years. David sang before Homer, and Solomon wrote his Proverbs and his Ecclesiastes before Solon, the oldest of them, was born.

We do not always recognize the fact, that the Hebrew, Egyptian, Grecian, Roman sages, in their different generations, lived around an almost common inland sea, whose bays, rivers, harbors, coasts were continually visited and penetrated by neighboring ships and coasting-vessels; and that as now, news was interesting and carried orally from city to city. In this way traditions, public facts, and opinions of cotemporary chief men were made more or less common property. Abraham's steward, for example, was a native of Damascus yet standing. Solomon's fame was commensurate with all the coasts of the Mediterranean sea. Hiram, king of Tyre, was in habitual intercommunication with him, "and his fame was in all nations round about." He was known in Egypt as more learned and wise than all the sages of Egypt—wiser than Ethan, Heman, Chalcal, Dardo, and all cotemporary princes, known to the Queen of Sheba in all the regions of Ethiopia. I trace to one family and to one man, whom we call Father Abraham, all the true moral science and religion in the world. We have, for a few generations, been sporting with physics and metaphysics; but that family studied God and man. Indeed they studied God in man, and man in God; God in the universe, and the universe in God.

Skeptics generally are more witty than wise, more pert than prudent, more talkative than learned. I have not had the good fortune to meet with a learned, well read, and well educated infidel in all my acquaintance. While they inveigh against Christian sects and their speculative and dogmatic

controversies, they are, to say the least, quite as dogmatic, controversial, and sectarian as Pagans, Jews, or Christians.

Pyrrho, the first distinguished skeptic among the Greek philosophers, formed the first Grecian school of *free-thinkers*, and gloried so much in skepticism that he denominated his school "*The School of Skeptics.*" His fellow-citizens in Elea, in the fourth century before Christ, constituted him their high-priest. "He denied the real existence of all qualities in bodies, except those which are essential to primary atoms, and referred everything else to the perceptions of the mind produced by external objects."

Hume, among the moderns, was substantially of the same character of philosophers. "He introduced doubts into every branch of physics, metaphysics, ethics, and theology." Gibbon, more eloquent but less philosophic than Hume, drank deeply at the fountains of infidelity in France and in England. He poisoned his own writings by a large infusion of the same principles.

Since the French Revolution till now, skepticism, in everything ancient and venerated, whether true or false, has been subjected to the same arbitrary inquisition; and Christianity, as well as Judaism, has largely shared in its indiscriminate crusade.

Kingcraft and priestcraft, unfortunately strongly allied in the dark ages, became equally obnoxious to suspicion, opposition and public resentment, and largely partook of the same fortunes. But in the long crusade it fared worse with religion than it did with politics. The state must be regarded at least as a *commonwealth*, and as such, governed by equal laws and ordinances. But religion was discarded, not merely from political amalgamation, but from the consideration and regard of the leading men of that period, as a subject not demanding immediate attention, and with the great majority as a matter of doubtful disputation.

"Free-thinking," as it was facetiously called, became fashionable, and, with the down-trodden and priest-trodden

masses, it was aped and assumed as a characteristic of at least a clever fellow, if not a philosopher. Thomas Paine began with his book on "*Common Sense*"—next he gave to his countrymen "THE RIGHTS OF MAN," then ended with "THE AGE OF REASON!" Volney, born twenty years after him, gave "*The Ruins of Empire*," or rather his "*meditations on the revolutions of empire*," well seasoned with inuendos against the authority of religion and revelation. But Voltaire had profusely sowed the seed "of irreligion, anarchy, and libertinism" before either of them was born. They only watered the seeds which he had sown. And what an abundant harvest of dwarfed philosophers, reckless declaimers, and arrogant dogmatists does the present generation exhibit!

Philosophic Robert Owen, a benevolent and urbane gentleman of large fortune and influential friends, well read in the light readings of early life, and deeply imbued, not merely with a generous sentimentality, but with a native and educational benevolence, in quest of a proper theater to develop a politico-moral problem, visited this New World some twenty-five years ago. Unfortunately he had not discriminated between the state-religions of Europe and the Christian religion of the New Testament. He therefore filed them all together on the same wire, and became THE PHILOSOPHER OF CIRCUMSTANCES. With the full assurance of knowledge he assaulted the full assurance of faith, and gave utterance to principles subversive of every existing social system, for the purpose of establishing a perfect social system. Christianity sternly stared him in the face; but with an unblenching eye he gazed and gazed upon her countenance, and challenged her to deadly combat or to an instant surrender. In placid temper she refused to give place to his mandates. He threw down the gauntlet with the air of a spirited cavalier, and dared her to a deadly combat. The glove was promptly lifted, and the conditions of the combat amicably settled. The theater was erected, the judges elected, the spectators convened, and the contest began. And here follows, approved by the combat-

ants, sealed by the reporter, and confirmed by the auditory, an authentic report of it. It speaks for itself. And after a successful mission across the continent and across the seas, it is encored, and is now about to commence a second pilgrimage from the very city where it occurred, and whence it was borne triumphant over America and over the British empire. There is nothing added, there is nothing subtracted, and there is nothing amended. It was, on our side, extemporaneous, on his, mainly premeditated and written out *in extenso*. It carries upon its visage the proofs of both. It was not as diversified as we desire, but it was our part to follow, and his to lead. We wove into it all that we could legitimately introduce, bearing upon the issue, and sowed broadcast the seeds and elements of other reasons and evidences than a stern umpirage would have allowed. This has its advantages on the principles of suggestion, and its disadvantages in point of method and concentrated argument. But for popular consumption and for popular effect, it appeared to be the most eligible; and the result has greatly transcended our most sanguine expectations. Thousands have been reclaimed from their skepticism, and thousands, that needed encouragement and corroboration, have been confirmed.

The forms of skepticism are Proteus like, multifarious; and if any other form, than those in this volume assailed and repelled, should be presented, we feel it our duty, and would regard it our privilege to meet it *calamo vel ore*,* as any champion of infidelity may choose.

There is much latent skepticism in the present church establishments in our land — indeed all over Christendom. It would be a good work to circulate the present volume far and wide, through our own country, as well as abroad. I would esteem it an advantage to the Church, as well as to the world, to have many discussions of this grandest of all debatable questions, with every grade of mind, intelligence, and character, entitled to public respect.

---

* With the pen or with the tongue.

The subject is itself transcendent, and the evidences of its truth and grandeur are commensurate with all its claims and pretensions, and with all the wants and necessities of this, alas! too lukewarm and sectarian generation. If any man, of indorsed reputation for talent, learning, and character, thinks he could have succeeded better than the champion, Robert Owen, we respectfully inform him, that we shall take pleasure in meeting him at a proper time and place. We shall hear him with candor, and answer him with due respect.

A. Campbell.

DEBATE

ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, ETC.

MR. OWEN'S OPENING ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators:

It is necessary on my part to explain the cause of the present meeting.

After much reading and calm reflection, early in life, and after extensive personal, and, in many instances, confidential communications with the leading characters of the present times, I was deeply impressed with the conviction that all societies of men have been formed on a misapprehension of the primary laws of human nature, and that this error has produced disappointment and almost every kind of misery.

I was also equally convinced that the real nature of man is adapted, when rightly directed, to attain high physical, intellectual, and moral excellence, and to derive from each of these faculties, a large share of happiness, or of varied enjoyment.

I was, in consequence, impressed with the belief, that I could not perform a greater service to mankind, than to endeavor to relieve them from this grievous error and evil. I made arrangements to apply all my faculties to discover the means by which it could be effected. For this purpose I instituted experiments in England and Scotland, to try the effects of some of these new principles in practice. I published preliminary remarks on the subject, and submitted them to the civilized governments of Europe and America. I visited various foreign countries, that I might communicate, personally, with the leading minds in each; and I presented an explanatory memorial to the congress of sovereigns and their ministers at Aix la Chapelle, in 1818.

I held public meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States; and I widely circulated these proceedings in every part of the world where the English language is known.

Finding that these practical experiments exceeded my most sanguine expectations, and that the most experienced, enlightened, and comprehensive minds, when confidentially applied to, admitted the

truth of the principles which I placed before them; and doubted, only, if the period had arrived when ignorance could be so far removed as to admit of their immediate introduction into practice; I applied myself to discover the best means by which these all-important truths might be taught, and all prejudices removed without producing the evils arising from sudden and extensive revolutions.

To effect these objects, I felt it was necessary to be governed through my whole course, as far as times and circumstances would admit, by the laws of nature, which appeared to me correctly true in principle, and beautiful and beneficial for practice.

I, therefore, placed these truths gradually before the public, sometimes in one form, and sometimes in another; but always in the least offensive manner I could devise.

When parties, whose prejudices were by these means aroused, became angry, and reviled, as it was natural for them to do, not understanding my object; I could not be angry and displeased with them, and, therefore, reviled not again; but I calmly put forth more and more of these truths, that ultimately all of them might be understood.

When the partisans of political parties fully expected I would unite with them in opposition to some part of the existing order of things, I could not join in their measures, knowing that they saw but a small part of the evil, which they fruitlessly, yet often honestly, endeavored to remove, and consequently erred in the means of attaining their object.

With my views I could belong to no party, because in many things, I was opposed to all. Yet I freely conversed and associated with all classes, sects, and characters; and it was interesting and instructive to discover the various impressions which were made on individuals belonging to all parties by the principles which I advocated. To many, according to their prejudices, I appeared a demon of darkness, or as some of them said, I "was worse than the Devil;" while to others I seemed an angel of light, or "the best man the world ever saw;" and, of course, of every gradation between these extremes.

Amid these conflicting feelings, I pursued the "even tenor of my way," and turned not from the great object I had in view, either to the right hand or to the left.

I thus proceeded, step by step, until the most important laws of our nature were unfolded; for I early perceived that a knowledge of these laws would soon unvail the three most formidable prejudices that ignorance of these laws had made almost universal.

These prejudices, arising from early education, are district religions in opposition to these divine laws, indissoluble marriages, and unnecessary private property.

Yet the prejudices produced by education on each of these subjects, are very different in various countries. Among most people, however, these prejudices, whatever form they may have taken,

have been deeply rooted, through a long succession of ages, and have uniformly produced the greatest crimes, suffering and misery; indeed almost all to which human nature is liable; for the natural evils of life are so few, they scarcely deserve consideration.

It, therefore, appeared to me to be the time when these artificial evils might be removed, and when an entire new order of things might be established.

Many well intentioned and partly enlightened individuals, who have not had an opportunity to reflect deeply on these subjects, imagine that it will be more easy to remove one of these evils at a time, not perceiving that they are three links, forming one chain: each link being absolutely necessary to support the other two, and, therefore, that they must all be retained or go together.

Instead of these links becoming a band to keep society in good order, and unite men in a bond of charity, justice, and affection, they form a chain of triple strength to retain the human mind in ignorance and vice, and to inflict every species of misery, from artificial causes, on the human race.

Seeing this, I was induced to develop other arrangements, all in accordance with the divine laws of our nature, and thus attempt to break each link of this magic chain, and thereby remove the only obstacles which prevent men from becoming rational and truly virtuous beings.

In these new arrangements, the countless evils which have been engendered by conflicting religions, by various forms of marriages, and by unnecessary private property, will not exist; but, instead thereof, real charity, pure chastity, sincere affections, and upright dealing between man and man, producing abundance for all, will everywhere prevail.

By pursuing this course I was, from the beginning, conscious that the worst feelings of those who have been trained in old prejudices must be more or less excited, and I would willingly have avoided creating even this temporary evil, if it had been practicable, but it was not. I endeavored, however, by calmness and kindness to turn aside these irrational feelings, well knowing that the parties were not the authors of the impressions made upon their respective organizations, and I strove to prevent any unnecessary pain in performing a duty which, to me, appears the highest that man can perform, and which I execute solely under the expectation of relieving future generations from the misery which the past and present have experienced.

In pursuance of these measures I last year delivered a course of lectures in New Orleans, explanatory of the principles and many details of the practice of the proposed system.

During the progress of these lectures many paragraphs appeared in the New Orleans newspapers giving a very mistaken view of the principles and plans which I advocated. Discovering that these paragraphs proceeded from some of the city clergymen, I put an

advertisement in the newspapers, offering to meet all the ministers of religion in the city, either in public or private, to discuss the subjects of difference between us, in order that the population of New Orleans might know the real foundation on which the old systems of the world were erected, and the principles on which the new system was advocated. These gentlemen, however, were unwilling to enter upon the discussion.

About the same period Mr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany in Virginia, was solicited by a brother minister, in the state of Ohio, to meet Dr. Underhill, who was publicly teaching, with success, the principles of the new system in the upper part of that state.

Mr. Campbell declined the call thus made upon him; but he offered as a shorter mode, in his own opinion, of terminating the difference, to meet me and discuss the merits of the old and new systems in public, at any time and place convenient to both.

He afterward, on seeing my proposals in the newspapers to meet the clergy of New Orleans on specific grounds, publicly offered to discuss those subjects with me at Cincinnati any time within twelve months from the date of his proposal.

Having occasion, about that period, to pass, on my way to Europe, within twenty miles of Mr. Campbell's residence, I went to see him to ascertain whether his proposal to meet me in public emanated from a conscientious desire to discover valuable truths for the benefit of the human race, or from a wish to attain a useless notoriety by a vain and futile contest of words without any definite meaning.

By my intercourse with Mr. Campbell I concluded he was conscientiously desirous of ascertaining truth from error on these momentous subjects, that he was much experienced in public discussions, and well educated for the ministry. His superior talents were generally admitted. Under these circumstances, I did not feel myself at liberty to decline the call he had publicly made upon me—I, therefore, agreed to meet him in this city, at this time, that we might, by a fair and open discussion of principles never yet publicly advocated, discover, if possible, the foundation of human errors respecting vice and virtue, and the real cause of the continuance at this day, over the world, of ignorance, poverty, disunion, crime, and misery; and, if practicable, lay a broad and solid foundation for a union of all tribes and people, that peace, good-will, and intelligence, may everywhere prevail, and contention and strife cease from the earth.

Such is the origin and progress of the events and circumstances which have produced the present assemblage at this place, and my sole wish is that it may terminate beneficially for mankind.

I wait Mr. Campbell's confirmation of this statement as far as he is personally concerned in it.

MR. CAMPBELL'S FIRST REPLY.

My christian friends and fellow-citizens!—In rising to address you on this occasion, I feel that I owe you an apology. Do you

inquire, For what! I answer, For bringing into public discussion the evidences of the christian religion. Not, indeed, as if either the religion itself, or the evidences of its truth and divine authority, had anything to fear from an examination, however public or however severe. Why, then, do you say, apologize for bringing this subject into public debate? Because, in so doing, we may appear to concede that it is yet an undecided question *sub judice;* or at least, that its opponents have some good reason for withholding their assent to its truth, and their consent to its requirements. Neither of which we are, at this time, prepared to admit.

It is true, indeed, that we christians are commanded by an authority which we deem paramount to every other, to be prepared, at all times, to give a reason for the hope which we entertain; and not only so, but in meekness, and with firmness, to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. If, then, it be our duty, either as teachers of the christian religion, or as private disciples, to be governed by these precepts, not only we can find an excuse for ourselves, but we hope that you also will find an excuse for us in the present undertaking. *Excuse*, did I say? Not excuse only, but more than excuse, both authority and encouragement.

Some christians, we know, think it enough simply to inveigh against skeptics and skepticism in their weekly harangues; while they are protected by custom and law from the retorts and replies of such as do not believe. This is not enough. If, indeed, all the skeptics in the vicinities of christian congregations made it a point to attend these weekly discourses, and if their objections and doubts were fairly met, canvassed, and refuted, then this course might suffice. But neither of these is precisely the case. The skeptics do not generally attend the places of worship; and few of the teachers of religion pay adequate attention to this description of character. In some christian countries, also, too much reliance is placed upon the strong arm of the law; and in this country, perhaps, too much confidence is reposed in the moral force of public opinion.

Skepticism and infidelity are certainly on the increase in this and other countries. Not, indeed, because of the mildness of our laws, but because of the lives of our professors, and a very general inattention to the evidences of our religion. The sectarian spirit, the rage of rivalry in the various denominations, together with many absurd tenets and opinions propagated, afford more relevant reasons for the prevalence of skepticism than most of our professors are able to offer for their faith.

Kingcraft and priestcraft, always german cousins at least, have so disfigured, or as they suppose, *ornamented* christianity, so completely disguised it, that many having no taste nor inclination for examining the inspired books, have hastily and peremptorily decided that all religion is the offspring of fraud or fiction. The ignorance of the multitude, and the knavery of the few, are the most puissant auxili-

aries of those daring and rash spirits who undertake to make it appear that the religious institutions of this country are founded on kingcraft or priestcraft.

I have sometimes been ready to conclude with Bishop Newton, in his illustrations of the prophesies, that the unhallowed alliance between kings and priests, of church and state, is destined to be finally destroyed by a momentary triumph of infidelity; or, to come nearer to his own language, that before the millennial order of society can be introduced, there will be a very general spread of infidelity. However this may be, for here we would not be dogmatical, we are assured that the progress of skepticism is neither owing to the weakness nor the paucity of the evidences of christianity; but to a profession of it unauthorized by, and incompatible with, the christian scriptures. These concessions we are compelled to make from a sense of justice to our cause; but in conceding so much, we give nothing away but what every christian would wish to see done away, viz: the abuses of the christian religion. Nor will we allow that there is even in the abuses of christianity any argument against its excellency, nor any just reason for the infidelity of any one who has access to the oracles of God.

When we agreed to meet Mr. Owen in public debate upon the questions to be discussed on this occasion, it was not with any expectation that he was to be convinced of the errors of his system on the subject of religion; nor with any expectation that I was in the least to be shaken in my faith in the sacred writings. It is to be presumed that Mr. Owen feels himself beyond the reach of conviction; and I most sincerely must declare that I have every assurance of the truth and authority of the christian religion. I know, indeed, that there is no circumstance in which any person can be placed more unfavorable to his conviction, than that which puts him in a public assembly upon the proof of his principles. The mind is then on the alert to find proofs for the system which has been already adopted, and is not disposed to such an investigation as might issue in conviction. Arguments and proofs are rather parried than weighed; and triumph rather than conviction is anxiously sought for. At the same time I own I am, on all subjects, open to conviction, and even desirous to receive larger measures of light; and more than once, even when in debate, I have been convicted of the truth and force of the argument of an opponent. Nor would I say that it is impossible that even my opponent might yet preach the faith which he has all his life labored to destroy. But the public, the wavering, doubting, and unsettled public, who are endangered to be carried off, as an apostle says, by the flood which the dragon has poured out of his mouth, are those for whose benefit this discussion has, on my part, been undertaken. They are not beyond the reach of conviction, correction, and reformation. For the present generation and the succeeding I have been made willing to undertake to show that there is no good reason

ity, a good conscience, a pure heart, universal love, a triumphant joy, and a glorious hope of immortal bliss, were its reward in hand. An incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading inheritance in the presence of God, with the society of angels, principalities and powers, of the loftiest intelligence and most comprehensive knowledge, brighter than the sun, in the glories of light and love eternal, are its rewards in future.

But now, let us ask, what boon, what honor, what reward have our opponents to offer for its renunciation? Yes, this is the question which the sequel must develop. To what would they convert us! What heaven have they to propose! What immortality to reveal! What sublime views of creation and a creator! What authentic record of the past! What prophetic hope of the future! What account of our origin! What high ultimatum of our destiny! What terrors have they to offer to stem the torrent of corruption! What balm and consolation to the sons and daughters of anguish! To these and a thousand kindred questions, they must, and they *will* answer, *none;* none at all. They promise to him that disbelieveth the Founder of the christian religion; to him that neglects and disdains the salvation of the gospel; to him who tramples under foot the blood of the New Institution, and insults the Spirit of favor; to him who traduces Moses, Daniel, and Job; to him who vilifies Jesus, Paul, Peter, James, and John; to him who devotes his soul to the lusts of the flesh; who disdains heaven; who deifies his appetites; who degrades himself to a mere animal, and eulogizes philosophy; to this man they promise eternal sleep, and everlasting death. This is the faith, the hope, and joy, for which they labor with so much zeal, and care, and pain.

Divesting man of all that renders life a blessing and death supportable, denuding him of the dignity and honor which have ever been the admiration of the wise and good, and reducing him wholly to the earth, is by our opponents the true philosophy, the just science, the valuable knowledge. In their estimation a colony of bees co-operating in the building of store-houses and cells, and afterward stowing them full of the necessaries of animal life, humming from flower to flower, while the sun shines; and in its absence, sucking the juices which they have collected, is the grand model of what man would be, and what he would do, were he under the benign influence of just knowledge and sound philosophy.

To accomplish this high and glorious end of our being is the supreme wish of my benevolent opponent. In the prosecution of which he labors to show us that matter—solid, liquid, gaseous matter—is the height and depth, the length and breadth of all that deserves the name of just knowledge. As for *souls*, and their appurtenances, they are mere nonentities, creatures of mere fancy, having neither figure, extension, nor gravity; old wives' fables, and ought to be all embarked in company with ghosts and witches, and

colonized on the point of a needle on some lofty peak in the regions of imagination.

When by a philosophic exorcism he has cast out these indescribable spirits which haunt the cells of our *crania*, and emptied our heads of all their intellectual contents, we are then to make the body, and especially the *abdominal viscera*, the all-engrossing topic of lifea nd death, and the capital item in our last will and testament.

Now let us glance at the method of argument by which this point is to be proved.

1. Man is to be detached from any relation to a Supreme or superior being. All debts of gratitude or obligation of any sort to an unseen or intangible agent are to be canceled by a single act of oblivion; and when he is taught to annihilate the Creator, he is next to be taught that he is himself neither *Creator nor creature*, but a sort of self-existent particle of a self-existent whole.

2. Lest he should be too uplifted in his own imagination, he is to be taught that he is no more than a two-legged *animal*, as circumscribed by *sense* as a mole or lobster.

3. That having but *five* senses, it is necessary that these should be analysed in order that he may be convinced that nothing can be known of which they are not the informers. Thus man, when perfectly reduced to a mere *sentient* being, is prepared to become a *sensualist*.

4. To complete the process of degradation, man is to be taught that he has no faculty, or power of learning or knowing anything but by his senses, or that he can receive no certain information from the testimony of his ancestors.

5. That all the information which is traditional or handed down, is false and incredible.

6. As to morality, it is just a due regard to *utility*. Bees are *moral* as well as men; and he is the most moral bee which creates the most honey and consumes the least of it.

We do not say that these are *verbatim*, or in *propria forma*, the identical positions of my opponent — they belong, perhaps, more justly to some of the fraternity, for you will remember that he confines himself to the following four grand points:

1. That all the religions in the world have been founded on the ignorance of mankind.

2. They are directly opposed to the never-changing laws of our nature.

3. That they have been and are the real source of vice, disunion, and misery of every description.

4. That they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family.—We shall be somewhat disappointed, however, if in the development they do not engross the preceding positions.

Were I at liberty to choose a method co-extensive with the whole range of skepticism, it would be such as the following:

1. I would propose to present some philosophic arguments demonstrative of the truth of revealed religion.

2. I would attempt to illustrate and press upon my opponent the nature and weight of the historic evidence.

3. I would then endeavor to show, from the christian religion itself, its certain divine origin.

4. And in the last place, I would undertake to prove, from the actual condition of the world, and the prophetic annunciations, the absolute certainty that this religion came from the Creator of the world.

Under these very general heads or chapters, I would not fear to introduce such a number and variety of distinct arguments and evidences, as I should think ought to silence the captious, convert the honest inquirer, and confirm the weak and wavering disciple. But in a discussion such as the present, it would be almost, if not altogether impossible, to pursue such a method; and as it devolves upon my opponent to lead the way, and upon me to follow, I can only promise that I will endeavor in the most methodical way, to bring forward the arguments which are couched in this arrangement; of which indeed, a very inadequate idea can be communicated in any schedule.

The preceding synopsis is more general than necessary; but it is adapted to the vague and diversified attacks upon the christian fortress by the skeptics of the present school. In the natural order of things we would confine ourselves to the following method:

1. State as a postulatum the following unquestionable fact;

That there is now in the world a book called the Old and New Testaments, purporting to contain a Revelation from the Creator of the universe. Then inquire—

2. By what agency or means this work came into existence. In the analysis of this question we would

1. Demonstrate that the religion contained in this book is predicated of certain matters of fact.

2. That our senses, and testimony or history are the only means by which we can arrive at certain information in any question of fact.

3. That there are certain infallible criteria by which some historic matters of fact may be proved true or false.

4. We would then specify these criteria, and

5. Show that we have all these criteria in deciding this question. This proved, and all that christians contend for must be conceded. We say that were we to be governed by the *natural* order, we would confine all our debate to this one question as detailed in these five items. All these indeed will come in course under 2d and 4th items in the synopsis proposed. But we cannot refrain from expressing our opinion, that all the rest is superfluous labor bestowed upon us, by the obliquity of the skeptical scheme. And moreover we must

add our conviction that, supposing we should fail in affording satisfactory data on the other topics, it is impossible to fail in the point upon which the strength and stress of the argument must rest.

In this candid and unreserved way, my fellow-citizens, we have laid before you our views and prospects in the opening of this discussion, which may give you some idea of what may be expected from this meeting. Your patience and indulgence may have to be solicited and displayed, and should we be compelled to roam at large over vast and trackless fields of speculation, and oftentimes to return by the same track, you will have the goodness to grant us all that indulgence which the nature of the case demands.

But we cannot sit down without admonishing you to bear constantly in mind the inconceivable and ineffable importance attached to the investigation. It is not the ordinary affairs of this life, the fleeting and transitory concerns of to-day or to-morrow; it is not whether we shall live all freemen, or die all slaves; it is not the momentary affairs of empire, or the evanescent charms of dominion—Nay, indeed, all these are but the toys of childhood, the sportive excursions of youthful fancy, contrasted with the questions, *What is man? Whence came he? Whither does he go?* Is he a mortal or an immortal being? Is he doomed to spring up like the grass, bloom like a flower, drop his seed into the earth, and die forever? Is there no object of future hope? No God—no heaven—no exalted society to be known or enjoyed? Are all the great and illustrious men and women who have lived before we were born, wasted and gone forever? After a few short days are fled, when the enjoyments and toils of life are over; when our relish for social enjoyment, and our desires for returning to the fountain of life are most acute? must we hang our heads and close our eyes in the desolating and appalling prospect of never opening them again, of never tasting the sweets for which a state of discipline and trial has so well fitted us? These are the awful and sublime merits of the question at issue. It is not what we shall eat, nor what we shall drink, unless we shall be proved to be mere animals; but it is, shall we live or die forever? It is as beautifully expressed by a christian poet—

> Shall spring ever visit the mouldering urn?
> Shall day ever dawn on the night of the grave?

MR. OWEN'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Before I commence the opening of this discussion I will state two axioms, and then proceed.

First Axiom.—Truth is always consistent with itself, consequently, each separate truth is in strict accordance with every other truth in the universe. Or in other words—

No two truths, upon subjects differing the most widely from each other, can ever be in opposition or contradiction to each other.

Second Axiom.—No name or authority, whatever may be its nature, can change truth into falsehood or falsehood into truth, or can, in

any way, make that which is true to be false, or that which is false to be true.

For truth is a law of nature, existing independent of all authority. Thus it is a law of nature, that one and one make two, and equally so that as one and one make two, two and two make four, and so on of all the combinations of numbers.

Now the united authorities of the universe could not, by their fiat, change these laws of nature and determine that one and one shall not make two, but three or any other number.

Here Mr. Owen begins to read the first part of his address.

My friends, for I trust we are all friends, we meet here to-day for no personal consideration ; our sole object is to ascertain *facts*, from which *true* principles may be obtained and introduced into practice for the benefit of the human race.

The discussion, which I am about to open between Mr. Campbell and myself, is one more important in its consequences, to all descriptions of men, than any, perhaps, which has hitherto occurred in the annals of history.

It is a discussion entered upon solely with a view, as I believe, to elicit truth, if it be now practicable, on subjects the most interesting to the whole family of mankind ; on subjects which involve the happiness or misery of the present and all future generations.

And our intention is to begin, to continue, and to terminate these proceedings with the good feelings, which ought always to govern the conduct of those who seek truth in singleness of heart, and with a sincere desire to find it.

Hitherto, assuredly, all mankind have been trained to be children of some national or local district, and, in consequence, they have been made to acquire errors which create, over the world, confusion of intellect and a necessary fatal division in practice.

We now, however, propose to develop facts, and truths deduced from them, through the knowledge of which these local prejudices shall gradually disappear and be finally removed.

We propose further, that, through a knowledge of these facts and truths, a practice shall be introduced which shall enable all to become affectionate and intelligent members of one family, having new hearts and new minds, and whose single object, through life, will be to promote each other's happiness, and thereby their own.

To attain this great end, we shall not now attack the errors of any particular local district, for, by so doing, the evil passions and bad feelings which local errors engender, are aroused and brought into injurious action ; but universal truths shall be unfolded, which shall destroy the seeds of those pernicious passions and feelings, and, instead thereof, produce knowledge, peace, and good-will among the human race.

In furtherance of this mighty change in the destinies of mankind, I am now to prove " that all the religions of the world have originated in error ; that they are directly opposed to the divine,

unchanging laws of human nature; that they are necessarily the source of vice, disunion, and misery; that they are now the only obstacle to the formation of a society, over the earth, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and affection. And that these district religions can be no longer maintained in any part of the world, except by keeping the mass of the people in ignorance of their own nature, by an increase of the tyranny of the few over the many."

It is my intention to prove these all-important truths, not by exposing the fallacies of the sources from whence each of these local religions have originated; but by bringing forth, for public examination, the facts which determine by what unchanging laws man is produced and his character formed; and by showing how utterly incapable all the religions which have hitherto been invented and instilled into the human mind, are to a being so created and matured.

It will be Mr. Campbell's duty to endeavor to discover error in this development, and, if he shall find any, to make the error known to me, and to the public, in a kind and friendly manner.

If, however, Mr. Campbell shall not detect any error in this statement, but, on the contrary, shall find that it is a plain development of facts, and just deductions therefrom, and in strict accordance with all other known facts, and well ascertained truths, as I most conscientiously believe it to be; then will it be equally his duty to declare to the public this truth, for the benefit of mankind.

After this shall be done, it will become the duty and interest of men of all other local districts, to ascertain the truth or error of these facts, and of the consequences to which it is stated they will lead in practice, and then, in the same kind and temperate manner, to publish, in the shortest period after such examination, the result, in order to remove error and establish truth.

It is only by this just and equitable mode of proceeding that truth can be elicited and made manifest for the good of mankind; that the real cause of disunion and misery can be detected and withdrawn from society, and that, in place thereof, a deep and lasting foundation can be laid, to establish, forever, among all people, union, peace, charity, and affection.

The facts from which I am compelled to believe that these all-important consequences are to arise, are:

1. That man, at his birth, is ignorant of everything relative to his own organization, and that he has not been permitted to create the slightest part of his natural propensities, faculties, or qualities, physical or mental.

2. That no two infants, at birth, have yet been known to possess precisely the same organization, while the physical, mental, and moral differences, between all infants, are formed without their knowledge or will.

3. That each individual is placed, at birth, without his knowledge or consent, within circumstances, which, acting upon his peculiar

organization, impress the general character of those circumstances upon the infant, child, and man. Yet that the influence of those circumstances is to a certain degree modified by the peculiar natural organization of each individual.

4. That no infant has the power of deciding at what period of time or in what part of the world he shall come into existence; of whom he shall be born, in what distinct religion he shall be trained to believe, or by what other circumstances he shall be surrounded from birth to death.

5. That each individual is so created, that when young, he may be made to receive impressions, to produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and to retain them with great tenacity.

6. That each individual is so created that he must believe according to the strongest impressions that are made on his feelings and other faculties, while his belief in no case depends upon his will.

7. That each individual is so created that he must like that which is pleasant to him, or that which produces agreeable sensations on his individual organization, and he must dislike that which creates in him unpleasant and disagreeable sensations; while he cannot discover, previous to experience, what those sensations should be.

8. That each individual is so created, that the sensations made upon his organization, although pleasant and delightful at their commencement and for some duration, generally become, when continued beyond a certain period, without change, disagreeable and painful; while, on the contrary, when a too rapid change of sensations is made on his organization, it dissipates, weakens, and otherwise injures his physical, intellectual, and moral powers and enjoyments.

9. That the highest health, the greatest progressive improvements, and the most permanent happiness of each individual depend, in a great degree, upon the proper cultivation of all his physical, intellectual and moral faculties and powers from infancy to maturity, and upon all these parts of his nature being duly called into action, at their proper period, and temperately exercised according to the strength and capacity of the individual.

10. That the individual is made to possess and to acquire the *worst* character, when his organization at birth has been compounded of the most inferior propensities, faculties and qualities of our common nature, and when so organized, he has been placed, from birth to death, amid the most vicious or worst circumstances.

11. That the individual is made to possess and to acquire a *medium* character, when his original organization has been created *superior*, and when the circumstances which surround him from birth to death produce continued *vicious* or *unfavorable* impressions. Or when his organization has been formed of *inferior* materials, and the circumstances in which he has been placed from birth to death are of a character to produce *superior* impressions only. Or when there has

been some mixture of *good* and *bad* qualities, in the original organization, and when it has also been placed, through life, in various circumstances of *good* and *evil*. This last compound has been hitherto the common lot of mankind.

12. That the individual is made the most *superior* of his species when his original organization has been compounded of the best proportions of the best ingredients of which human nature is formed, and when the circumstances which surround him from birth to death are of a character to produce only *superior* impressions; or, in other words, when the circumstances, or laws, institutions, and customs, in which he is placed, are all in unison with his nature.

These facts, remaining the same, at all times in all countries, are the divine revelations to the whole human race. They constitute laws of nature, not of man's invention; they exist without his knowledge or consent; they change not by any effort he can make, and as they proceed, solely from a power or a cause unknown and mysterious to him, they are then a divine revelation, in the only correct sense in which the term can be applied.

Considered separately and united, and viewed in all their bearings and consequences, these divine laws of human nature form the most perfect foundation for a divine moral code—a code abundantly sufficient to produce, in practice, all virtue in the individual and in society, sufficient to enable man, through a correct knowledge thereof, to "work out his own salvation" from sin or ignorance and misery, and to secure the happiness of his whole race.

For as the first law teaches that, as all men are created by a power mysterious and unknown to themselves, they can have no merit or demerit for their *original formation* or *individual organization;* that, consequently, the pride of birth or superior physical form or of intellectual capacity, are feelings proceeding, alone, from an aberration of intellect produced by ignorance, and therefore irrational. And the second law teaches us that, as no two infants are born alike, and as they have no knowledge how the difference is produced, we ought not to be *displeased* or to *blame* any individuals, tribes, or people; or to be less *friendly* to them because they have been made to differ from us in *color, form,* or *features.*

The third law teaches us that, as each individual, at birth, may be placed, without his knowledge or consent, within circumstances, to force him to become any of the general characters now known to exist in any part of the world, we ought not to be displeased with those who have been made to differ from ourselves in birth, in language, in religion, in manners, in customs, in conditions, in thinking, in feeling, or in conduct. On the contrary, we are taught to know that this difference, to whatever extent it may proceed, is no more than a necessary effect arising from the general, national, and district circumstances in which they have been placed, modified by the peculiar organization of each individual, and that, as neither the organization or these circumstances were formed by them, to be sur-

prised or displeased, in consequence of their existence, is a certain proof, that we, ourselves, are in an irrational state, and influenced, alone, by ignorance of our nature. By this law we are further taught, that all feelings of anger and irritation will entirely cease, as soon as we shall acquire a real knowledge of our nature; that these feelings belong to man only during his irrational state of existence, and that when he becomes enlightened, and shall be made a rational being, they will no longer be found in human society. Instead of these irrational feelings, engendered solely by ignorance of this law of our common nature, we shall, through a knowledge of it, acquire a never-ceasing, never-tiring practical charity for the whole human race; a charity so efficient, so sincere, and so pure, that it will be impossible for any one, thus taught from infancy, to think ill of, or to desire the slightest injury to, any one of his fellow-beings.

By the fourth, fifth, and sixth laws, we are taught that a knowledge of the principles contained in the preceding laws, is so essential to the well-being of the human race, that it is again and again reiterated, through each of these laws, in every form the most likely to make the deepest impressions on our minds. They express, in language which no one can misunderstand, the ignorance and folly of individual pride and assumed consequences on account of birth, religion, learning, manners, habits, or any other acquirement or qualification, physical, intellectual, or moral; and give an entire new and different direction to all our thoughts, feelings, and actions, and we shall no longer consider man formed to be the ignorant, vicious, and degraded being, that, heretofore, he has been compelled to appear, whether covered by the garb of savage or civilized life.

The seventh law teaches us, that there is no power, and of course no right in one man to attempt to compel another to like or dislike anything or any person at his bidding or command; for this law shows that liking or disliking, as well as believing or disbelieving, are involuntary acts of our nature, and are the necessary, and therefore, the right impressions made upon our senses. Merit and demerit, therefore, for liking or disliking, for believing or disbelieving, will be no longer attributed to man, than while the human race remains in an irrational state. Marriage, prostitution, jealousy, and the endless sexual crimes and diseases which these have engendered, have arisen solely from ignorance of this fundamental or divine law of our nature; and, in consequence, real chastity is unknown among the greater part of the human race; but, in place thereof, a spurious chastity exists, producing insincerity, falsehood, deception, and dissimulation.

The eighth and ninth laws teach us the necessity for, and the advantages to be derived from, cultivating and duly exercising all the propensities, faculties, and powers with which nature has supplied us, and the folly of permitting any one of them to lie dormant, unused, or unenjoyed, or to be over-exerted and injured. These laws thus teach us the benefit of well-directed industry, the evil of idle-

ness, and the all-importance of temperance in the use of each of our faculties, physical, intellectual, and moral, and the lamentable error man has committed, through ignorance, in every department of human society. He has divided and subdivided the physical and intellectual faculties among various classes of individuals, while the laws of our nature have determined that the highest happiness human nature is formed to experience must be derived from a temperate exercise of all its powers of enjoyment.

The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth laws teach us by unfolding, in the most plain and obvious manner, how the varied character of man has been formed, what practical measures must be adopted before man can become an intelligent and rational being; that he must be trained and educated from infancy to maturity, altogether different from what he has been, in order that he may be taught to acquire, without exception, kind feelings, superior dispositions, habits, manners, knowledge, and conduct; the difference between them being in variety and degree, but never in kind and quality. The character will be thus always formed to be good to the extent that the natural powers will permit it to be carried; but as we have been taught, by all the preceding laws, that no individual can form any part of his natural powers, none will be blamed or will suffer in consequence of possessing incurable natural defects, but, on the contrary, all will have pleasure in devising and applying means to diminish their inconvenience. By these laws, we are taught, that the proper training and education of the young of the rising generation, is, by far, the most important of all the departments of the society, and will receive the first consideration, as soon as men can be found to be rational. That there is but one simple principle applicable to this practice, and it is, to remove all the vicious circumstances now existing in the laws, institutions, and customs which man, through ignorance, has introduced, in opposition to the laws of human nature, and, in their place, establish virtuous circumstances, that is, laws, institutions, and customs, in unison with the divine or natural laws of human nature. These laws teach that all human wisdom consists alone in this mode of acting, and that, whatever conduct man may adopt which differs from it, emanates from ignorance, and must be irrational.

And from these divine laws we learn generally, that man is now, and ever has been, a being essentially formed according to the nature, kind, and qualities of the circumstances in which he is permitted to live by his immediate predecessors. That when these circumstances are of an inferior and vicious character, man, of necessity, while under their influence, must become inferior and vicious; and when these circumstances are of a superior and virtuous character, in like manner, while under their influence, he must become superior and virtuous.

The great business of human life, in a rational state of society, will be, therefore, to acquire an accurate knowledge of the science of the

influence of circumstances over human nature, both previous and subsequent to birth; to prepare the means by which all shall be taught to understand the principles and practices by which each of the inferior or vicious circumstances, surrounding human life, may be withdrawn, in the shortest time, with the least inconvenience to all, and replaced by others which shall benefit every one.

The knowledge of this new code will thus speedily lead to a new life, in which all men will be regularly trained from infancy, to acquire the most valuable knowledge with the best dispositions, habits, manners, and conduct.

Under this new dispensation, their characters will be so completely changed or new-formed, that, in comparison of what they have been and are, they will become beings of a superior order; they will be rational in all their thoughts, words, and actions.

They will be indeed regenerated, for "their minds will be born again" and old things will be made to "pass away and all to become new."

This in our day, in part, but more fully and completely in the next succeeding generation, shall the prophesies of the partial knowledge of the past time be fulfilled, not, indeed, by disturbing the whole system of the universe, by any supposed fanciful miracles, effected in opposition to the unchanging laws of nature, but they will be accomplished by the regular progress of those laws, which, from the beginning, were abundantly sufficient to execute in due time all the purposes of that power from which these laws proceed.

The principles and practice thus developed of the new moral code, is a mere outline of the mighty change which it will effect; imperfect however, as it is, it is yet sufficient to afford some idea of the advantages which a progress in real knowledge, derived from simple facts and almost self-evident truths, can give to the world.

These twelve primary laws of human nature also form a standard, by which moral and religious truth or falsehood can be unerringly known; for as truth must be one throughout the universe, no two truths can ever be, at any time or in any place, in opposition to each other, and therefore, all that shall be found, under every varied comparison, to be in unison with these divine laws, must be true, while all that is in discordance with them must be false. By the application, therefore, of this standard, the truth or falsehood of all religious and moral codes will be discovered, and the utility or injury of all institutions will be easily ascertained.

Were we now, in detail, to apply this divine standard of truth to all the past and present civil and religious codes, it would soon become manifest that they have, one and all, originated in times of great darkness, when men were too ignorant of their own nature, and of the most simple laws of nature, generally, to detect imposition or error, however incongruous or contradictory one part of it might be to another.

That these religious and moral codes were produced at a period

when men were without sufficient experience to "understand what manner of beings they were," and when the wildest and most incoherent flights of the imagination, of some deluded individuals, were received as the inspirations of some single or compound divinity. That these imaginary inspired individuals, themselves deluded by an overheated imagination, or intending to delude their followers, succeeded at different times, in various parts of the earth, in promulgating, by force, fraud, or ignorance, the most unnatural fables and the most obscure and contradictory doctrines.

And as such doctrines and fables could not, at first, be received, except through force, fraud, or ignorance, they have been the cause of shedding the blood of the most conscientious and best men in all countries, of deluging the world in all manner of crime, and in producing all kinds of suffering and misery.

But to apply this standard to these systems, fables and doctrines, in detail, would be to proceed contrary to the plan laid down at the commencement. It would be, to arouse all the ignorant prejudices and bad feelings which these institutions have implanted in the human constitution, at so early an age as to induce many to believe that they really form part of our original organization.

Suffice it, however, to say, that these fables and doctrines, one and all, are in direct opposition to the twelve primary laws of human nature; that, consequently, they run counter to nature, and generally make virtue to consist in thinking and acting contrary to nature; and vice, in thinking and acting in unison with nature. Through these irrational conceptions of right and wrong, these religious laws and institutions have filled the world with innumerable, useless, absurd, or horrible forms and ceremonies, instead of the simple practice of virtue in accordance with our nature. They have created such a multiplicity of folly, confusion, and irrationality, that there is no one "that knoweth or doeth what is right; no, not one."

For instead of producing real knowledge, they perpetuate ignorance; instead of creating abundance, without any fear of want, they produce poverty, or the perpetual fear of it. Instead of permitting the regular exercise of the propensities, formed by nature to promote health and happiness, they force them by unnatural restraints, to become violent passions, which interfere with, and disturb every beneficial arrangement that can be devised for the amelioration of society.—Thus engendering the worst feelings that can be implanted in human nature, instead of the best. They produce hypocrisy and every conceivable deception, instead of sincerity and truth without any guile; anger and irritation, instead of commiseration and kindness; war, instead of peace; religious massacres, instead of universal charity: hatred, suspicions, oppositions, and disunion, instead of confidence, mutual aid, union and affection, among the whole family of mankind.

And thus, by these contradictory fables and doctrines, with their

innumerable useless and deteriorating forms and ceremonies, the earth has been filled with all manner of *strife* and *confusion* even to the *mad* destruction of whole nations and tribes, creating miseries which it would exhaust language to describe.

And so long as any of these fables and doctrines shall be taught, as divine truths, by men who have a supposed interest in their promulgation, and in their reception by the ignorant multitude; so long, we are compelled to believe, will all these vicious evils prevail and increase.

It is now evident to me, that all codes or laws, to be beneficial to mankind, and to be permanent, must be, without exception, in accordance with all the divine laws of human nature.

For when human laws are opposed to divine laws, confusion, crimes, and misery are sure to be produced. We have seen that all past and present human laws and institutions, are in opposition to those laws, which experience has now ascertained to be the divine laws of human nature, and they have, therefore, undergone continual change and produced continual disappointment.

When men shall acquire sufficient wisdom or experience to induce them to abrogate all existing laws and institutions which are unnatural, and to contend no longer against the divine laws of human nature, but shall agree to adjust their governments and institutions solely by those laws; then, and not before, will peace be established on earth and good will among mankind.

It is the popular belief which prevails in all countries in the supposed divine authority for these fables and doctrines, that alone keeps men now in ignorance of their nature, of the divine laws of which it is organized at birth and conducted to maturity and death. And this popular belief is produced in each of these countries, solely by the early and long-continued impressions, forced on the minds of the population by the most unnatural and artificial means.

For these impressions are forced into the young mind before the intellectual faculties are matured, when they are wholly incompetent to know good from evil, right from wrong, or truth from error.

It is thus that children are compelled to receive as divine truths the fables and doctrines prevalent in the country in which they happen to be born and live. It is thus that men are made to deride and vilify those fables and doctrines, in opposition to their own, which are also taught in other countries as divine truths, of which it is the most heinous crime even to doubt. It is thus that men are compelled to dislike and hate and contend against each other even to death, for a difference of opinion respecting some of these fanciful fables or doctrines which were formed in them, without their knowledge, will, or consent. And all this evil and misery has been created, solely, for the supposed benefit of the governing few, and of the priesthood. And it is thus that Pagans, Gentoos, and Cannibals, that Hindoos, Chinese, Jews, and Mahometans are made

at this day; and, my friends, it is thus, and thus *alone*, that you have been made, and that you are making your children Christians

MR. CAMPBELL'S SECOND REPLY.—

Mr. Chairman—At this stage of the discussion I do not wish to occupy many minutes in descanting upon the method of debate; but I must beg to be indulged in a few general remarks on the matter or the *allegata* of this discussion, and the *method* adopted by my opponent. I do cherish the most kind feelings toward Mr. Owen. I am sorry that controversial rules require me to call him my opponent. This term I use with perfect good-will toward him. I am satisfied that Mr. Owen is doing that which he conceives to be just and right. I take this occasion explicitly to declare that such is my conviction. At the same time I am just as fully persuaded that the aberrations and mistakes into which he has fallen are properly referable, not so much to any want of verity in his documents, as to his loose and illogical reasonings upon what he is pleased to call "*facts*" and "*laws of nature*."

My friend and opponent has stated some facts accordant with the experience of all mankind. To discriminate his real from his imaginary facts is not now my object, so much as it is to advert to the method he adopts. His *manner*, rather than his *matter*, now claims my attention. His *manner* is certainly loose and declamatory; and as he does not exhibit any bearing or connection existing between his *allegata* and the affirmative propositions which he intends to prove by them, he necessarily imposes upon himself as well as the audience. Therefore, in order to bring the *allegata* and *probata* of our logical disputation (for I trust this is to be a logical disputation) in a more orderly way before us, it will be necessary for me to advert to the original propositions which have been mutually acceded to, as constituting the topics of the discussion at present before us.

Here Mr. Campbell read the propositions which Mr. Owen stood pledged to prove:—

"TO THE CLERGY OF NEW ORLEANS.

"*Gentlemen*—I have now finished a course of lectures in this city, the principles of which are in direct opposition to those which you have been taught it your duty to preach. It is of immense importance to the world that truth upon these momentous subjects should be now established upon a certain and sure foundation. You and I, and all our fellow-men, are deeply interested that there should be no further delay. With this view, without one hostile or unpleasant feeling on my part, I propose a friendly public discussion, the most open that the city of New Orleans will afford, or, if you prefer it, a more private meeting; when half a dozen friends of each party shall be present, in addition to half a dozen gentlemen whom you may associate with you in the discussion. The time and place of meeting to be of your own appointment."

"I propose to prove, as I have already attempted to do in my lectures, that all the religions of the world have been founded on the ignorance of mankind; that they are directly opposed to the never changing laws of our nature; that they have been, and are, the real source of vice, disunion, and misery of every description; that they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family; and that they can be no longer maintained except through the ignorance of the mass of the people, and the tyranny of the few over that mass."

"With feelings of perfect good will to you, which extend also in perfect sincerity to all mankind, I subscribe myself your friend in a just cause." "ROBERT OWEN."

Now, said Mr. Campbell, it is surely illogical to say that what will logically prove the first position, will logically prove the second. If each of these positions is to be distinctively asserted, the facts and reasonings supporting each must be as distinctively adduced. Each position requires a regular induction of facts and documents to sustain it. There can be no separation of argument from fallacy by the clear, simple rules of pure unsophisticated logic, if we deal in such loose and general declamations. Our argumentation might thus be drawn out *ad infinitum*, without the remotest probability of ever arriving at any *logical* conclusion. If the truth is to be elicited, for the love of truth let us close the door against the admission of all extraneous and irrelevant matter.

We have heard some positions, called "twelve facts," or "twelve fundamental laws," stated; but the question (*logice*) is, What are these "twelve facts to *prove?* How are they logically to be *applied?* To the first, second, or to all these five positions? I must reiterate that what may logically prove the first position, cannot, *ex necessitate*, prove the last; and that such facts and reasonings as may prove the last cannot prove the first. We must have a regular logical connection and dependence between the *allegata* and *probata*. Without this, how can our hearers or readers learn (for this matter is for the press) how much logical argument, how much fact, how much demonstration has been elicited in this discussion?

I now state another preliminary difficulty or objection to our *modus operandi*, which a feeling of self-respect requires me to have removed. It is not improbable, from the turn that things have taken, that there are numbers who at this moment misapprehend the true object of this controversy. From a letter which appeared in the *London Times* last October, it had been stated in the public prints in this city, that I had agreed to meet Mr. Owen for an object, *toto cælo*, different from that contemplated in my acceptance of Mr. Owen's challenge.

In that communication I was represented as being about to co-operate with Mr. Owen in an attempt to expunge the abuses of all religions, and to form out of them all a consistent and rational reli-

gion adapted to all ages and nations. But we shall permit this letter to speak for itself:—

"LETTER IN THE LONDON TIMES."

"SIR—I authorize you to state that the paragraph which appeared in the Times and some other London papers, a few days since, purporting to give a detail of my intended proceedings, and which was copied from the Scotsman newspaper, published in Edinburgh, was given to the public without my knowledge, and that it is incorrect in some important particulars. The object of the meeting between the clergy and myself, in April next, in the city of Cincinnati, state of Ohio, in the United States, is not to discuss the truth or falsehood of the christian religion, as stated in the Scotsman, but to ascertain the errors in all religions which prevent them from being efficacious in practice, and to bring out all that is really valuable in each, leaving out their errors, and thus to form from them collectively a religion wholly true and consistent, that it may become universal, and be acted upon conscientiously by all."

"Neither is it my intention to remove finally from this country, as stated in the Scotsman, On the contrary, I have purposely made arrangements to be, without inconvenience, in any part of the world in which my earnest endeavors to ameliorate the present condition of society shall appear to be the most useful, as I do not entertain the least doubt of an entire change being near at hand, in the commercial, political, and religious policy of all nations."

"The very small amount of benefits that is effected for the great mass of mankind, with the extraordinary powers for insuring general prosperity, now possessed by society, united with the daily growing intelligence of the population in civilized countries, render, I think, this change not only unavoidable, but not very distant.

"ROBERT OWEN."

You will perceive that this representation of this discussion is very different from Mr. Owen's challenge, published in New Orleans, upon which the debate is based. I now put the question to my friend Mr. Owen, categorically, whether I ever did, directly, or indirectly, accede to, or propose, a scheme of the character portrayed in this letter? This is a question which Mr. Owen will soon have an opportunity to meet and answer. Mr. Owen's simple affirmation or negation on this point will clear up the whole of this preliminary difficulty, and exonerate me from the calumnies of one of the editors of this city. And while on the subject of preliminary difficulties, it is necessary for me to remark, that there can be no development of logical truth without the nicest precision and co-intelligence in the use of our terms. It is a rule of logical interpretation, that all words are to be received and understood according to their most usual and known acceptation; and if there is to be any co-intelligence in the use of *terms* between Mr. Owen and myself, he must not establish a peculiar vocabulary of his own, but permit me to *understand* his

terms according to their usual and most ordinary acceptation. Let me not be supposed destitute of a just contempt for mere *verbal* criticism or hypercriticism. I am not contending that if the law of the state of Ohio should say that whoever *drew blood* in Cincinnati should suffer death, that this law should be interpreted to apply to the case of a surgeon who opened the vein of a man who fell down in Main Street with a fit. But I *do* contend that between Mr. Owen and myself, there must be, in the course of this discussion (if it is to be governed by polemic laws), a co-intelligence, co-application, and co-acceptation of such terms as are of cardinal importance in the questions at issue. For example, the terms, *divine, divinity, religion, virtue, moral law, created, Creator, etc., etc.,* are to be found in the christian vocabulary. These terms Mr. Owen uses; but in what sense? In the christian acceptation, or in a private interpretation of his own? I may very appositely inquire of Mr. Owen whether he has not a peculiar phraseology of his own, and whether he does not annex a very different meaning to these terms, *divine, divinity, religion, intellectual, moral, virtue, vice, etc.,* from what he may rationally suppose is my acceptation of them and that of *all* other christians? Is it candid or honest to use our terms in a sense different from that we have stipulated? I hold myself bound to render the most precise definition of any term which I may use, when called upon by my opponent; wherefore I apprehend that he cannot complain that I should mete out the same measure to him, and insist on the like precision and perspicuity on his part. If Mr. Owen will use Bible terms, let him use them in the Bible sense, or tell us honestly what meaning he attaches to them. He must either believe in the Bible, or he conceives its language superior to all other language, or he would not impose upon our understanding by a parade of words, well approved in the vulgar sense, but rejected in his acceptation. But I confine not this inquiry nor these remarks to Bible terms only, but to all the current terms in religious discussion, morality and philosophy. Everything depends upon precision and co-intelligence in the use of terms. I apprehend it is altogether unnecessary to elaborate this matter any further. Will Mr. Owen have the goodness to explain himself in this particular? The simple naked question is, Does Mr. Owen use certain very significant terms, such as those specified, in the commonly received significance?

I would appeal to the gentlemen who moderate this discussion, whether the exceptions I have taken to the course pursued by Mr. Owen, are not reasonable; whether the queries I have proposed to him for solution, are not pertinent and necessary; and especially, I would request them to decide one important question of order, viz: Whether Mr. Owen is not logically bound to show some logical connection between the matter he reads and some one of the positions he has undertaken to prove. The same matter cannot be received in evidence of each position; it must apply to some *one* in particular; it cannot to *all*, unless they be identical positions.

Here it was suggested to Mr. Owen (by the Board), that all the arguments which he might be about to introduce in support of any one *of his positions might have exclusive relevance, and pertinence, and logical connection, with that single position. The Board thought that Mr. Owen was,* logice, *bound to exhibit the logical connection and dependence between his proofs and positions.*

Mr. Campbell proceeded—As matters now stand, everything is perfectly intangible. There has been nothing presented that mortal man can logically prove or disprove—no matter whether he espouses the affirmative or negative of the proposition. And why? The *why* is as plain as the way to the parish church? The *why* is, that there is not a single *quod erat demonstrandum* logically before Mr. Owen, myself, or the audience. It must, I repeat, be obvious to men of the plainest understanding that the clear and simple rules of unsophisticated logic (indispensable to the elicitation of truth in all literary questions) can never be brought to bear or to apply in the present vascillating state of the premises. In this *chaotic* state of the premises, what can Mr. Owen's twelve fundamental laws, or, as he calls them, *facts*, prove, even admitting that they carried along with them internal evidence of their own absolute verity.

Now, were I to admit that Mr. Owen's laws contained a great many facts, and this I am by no means unwilling to admit, yet how can I save any one of these facts from the general wreck which must await his deductions, if he will not place himself *logically* in my power. Must I deny all Mr. Owen's philosophical and mathematical, or other scientific facts, in order that I may place myself in a logical predicament to take exceptions to any two out of the whole twelve?

If Mr. Owen attempt to prove a *metaphysical* position by those arguments which, in the nature of things, can only elucidate a truth in physics, how can I join issue with him? How can this be expected from me? The corollary of the whole matter is this, that if this matter be not *logically* discussed, it cannot be discussed at all in the manner its own intrinsic dignity requires, or in the manner which public expectation and the deference the disputants owe to the public would seem to require. And if Mr. Owen will not acknowledge himself amenable and conformable to those equitable laws which govern and control all argumentative discussions, it is impossible for me to dispute with him. It is impossible for me to reply to anything he may advance in a shape so loose, so desultory, and so intangible.

There is no man, and perhaps never was there a man, more distinguished for *moral courage* than Robert Owen. Let this moral courage now support him; and let him boldly, frankly, explicitly, and logically, come out with those premises, if any he have, which I stand here prepared to combat. But if Mr. Owen will not take an affirmative logical position, nor sustain those which he promised to sustain, let him avow it, and then I will abandon my vantage

ground, and take affirmative positions, subversive of his whole scheme, which I think are as logically immovable as the rock of Gibraltar.

Mr. Owen well knows if he were to take up a mathematical position and fortify it, he would laugh at and condemn every other weapon but mathematical weapons. He would exclaim against all other proofs, illustrations, or reasonings, save mathematical axioms, deductions, and demonstrations. He would tell me that I might as reasonably expect to batter down mud or stone walls with roses, as to adduce Doctor Darwin's "Loves of the Plants" in refutation of a mathematical hypothesis.

Mr. Owen well knows that a mathematical discussion must be argued mathematically—so of botanical, geological, and astronomical questions, and so on throughout the whole circle of the sciences.

Mr. Owen, in his essay and in his comments upon his fundamental laws of human nature, has brought forward mathematical illustrations; but does he expect to prove to your minds, the fallacy of *christianity* by *mathematical* demonstrations, by the verity of those laws which establish the mathematical properties of triangles? I contend that the grand question at issue is a question of fact, chiefly dependent upon historic evidence. Now, can we take a pair of brass compasses and measure that evidence as we would measure the degrees of any given angle in mathematics; or by addition and subtraction prove it, as we would a question in arithmetic? We cannot measure historic evidences as if they were so many mathematical lines. If this be a mathematical, anatomical, botanical question, let Mr. Owen, with that candor which he claims as so peculiarly and almost exclusively his own—I say, let him at once openly avow which of these it is, and *then*, perhaps, we may be able to discuss its merits, either mathematically, botanically, or physiologically. I aver that the christian religion is founded upon facts, upon veritable, historical, incontrovertible facts—facts *triable* by all the *criteria* known to the courts of law in the ascertainment of what is or is not established in evidence—facts triable by all the historic criteria which any respectable historian of ancient or modern times has ever had for his pilots. These facts of which the christian religion is predicated, either are or are not susceptible of proof. Let Mr. Owen impugn them, or put me to the proof. I say again, rather let him do this than read irrelevant matter, or loosely declaim against everything in the general, and disprove nothing in the detail. If this be a simple question of *fact*, it must be tried and examined as such. It would be unjust to try it before any other tribunal. Mr. Owen would not expect me to ascertain the number of cubic inches in any given tub of water, if he require me to measure it by a peddler's ell—nor could he expect me to measure the length of a given web by a gallon. Were he to require me to prove his axiomatic mathematical truth that 2 and 2 make 4, I might reply that this was axiomatic or self-evident, and therefore incapable of proof, unless he was prepared to

deny that this whole is made up of the sum of all its parts. But suppose he could so *maneuver* as to put me on the proof, would I go about it in like manner as I would essay to prove the *locale* of Washington's nativity, or as I would essay to analyze the moral qualities of that moral hero? Would I essay to prove an axiomatic truth in mathematics by the same process of reasoning which I would adopt to prove a *topical* fact, or a moral truth. My *caveat* is that this is purely a question of fact, subject to all the common sense criteria by which all facts ever have been and ever must be tried, and that it is not triable by those criteria which we could rationally institute and recognize as the fair, true, and legitimate criteria of the verity of mathematical, botanical, geological, or even *moral* facts, if you please. 'Tis a naked, simple, historic question, and *ex necessitate rei*, can only be passed through the *historical*, *logical*, and *philosophical* crucibles. Mr. Owen, I think, cannot deny this. As a lover of truth he is bound to declare whether he conceives me obliged to defend my cause by historic and veritable *evidence*, or by mathematical demonstrations. Only let him tell me what are his rules of evidence; what species of evidence he conceives admissible, and what inadmissible; and then we may happen to light upon tangible and pertinent premises. But as matters now stand, all must necessarily be air-built; for this plain reason, that there is not one hair's breadth of foundation for either of us to erect any other kind of superstructure upon.

My friend, Mr. Owen, must perceive that here is neither time, place, nor subject, for vain, empty declamation. His own tact, discrimination, and knowledge of the world and its concerns, must indicate to him the necessity of our mutually confining this discussion within its legitimate and logical bounds and precincts.

Perhaps I have elaborated this matter to tediousness; but I claim a fair start in this race, and in conclusion, as my half hour is out, I call on Mr. Owen for a *precise* and *technical* definition of his terms—and for an explanation of the misrepresentations in his letter to the editor of the London Times, if, indeed, that was his letter.

MR. OWEN'S THIRD ADDRESS.

I see no necessity of replying, at present, to any part of my friend's last address, save so much as relates to the communication which appeared in the London Times newspaper. In regard to that letter, I have only to say, it is my letter; I wrote it, and sent it to the press. When that letter was written, it did not, nor does it now, appear to me, that I stand pledged to prove the fallacy of the christian religion, separated from all other religions. To me, they all appear one and the same in principle and in general practice, except the difference in the rites and ceremonies, which I deem mere forms. I believe that my words are that *all* religions of the *world* are founded in error—the christian religion is embraced in the word *all*. Mr. Campbell should not presume that I have already stated

all that may be brought forward, if more shall be required. I think Mr. Campbell will be satisfied, after a little while, that I have adhered closely to the spirit of the engagement. When I shall have presented the whole of my views, Mr. Campbell will have an opportunity of discovering the connection of each part with the whole, and of making a reply accordingly. I have no wish that anything abstract or metaphysical should make its way into this discussion, to render it too complex for plain men to understand. Let us have nothing to distract our attention from plain, simple truth, and, if possible, from facts, and just reasoning from them. In the course of this discussion, I can assure Mr. Campbell that I have not the least desire to avail myself of any advantage which might possibly accrue to me by reason of our having different vocabularies, or of our discordant acceptation of terms; but I shall pursue a straight-forward path to endeavor to elicit truth, and shall explain, where necessary, the meaning which I annex to my letters. As it would be, however, unfair to expect Mr. Campbell, or any other person, to reply off-hand to the mass of matter that will be presented, I wish him to take home my manuscript, and to have time allowed him to consider them at his leisure. I do not desire to take any advantage in the present discussion; my sole object is, if possible, to discover truth for the benefit of all.

Here Mr. Owen read the letter to the editor of the London Times, or a part of it.

Now, said Mr. Owen, I believe I have to show that not only the christian religion, but also, all other religions are founded in ignorance, etc. If such be the case, I hope to make the truth so plain that all may understand it, and derive the practical benefit from it which it is my sole object to produce.

Mr. Campbell rose and said—that the object stated in that letter was to elicit all that is valuable in each religion, and to reject all that is false. Now, if it be Mr. Owen's object, by this meeting, to form a new religion, extracted from all religions, and partaking of the excellencies of each, and rejecting all that is erroneous in each of them, I can only say that this is a very different meeting from any that I have ever contemplated. But I ask Mr. Owen, continued he, did I agree to such an undertaking?

Mr. Owen said—Mr. Campbell agreed to this meeting in the exact terms of my challenge to the clergy in New Orleans, and to no other. But this must elicit all that is true in the principles of all religions, and thus bring out all that is perfect in each.

Mr. Campbell adds—I only wish it to be distinctly understood, that I have never even connived at a convention having such an object in view as stated in the London Times.

Here the Hon. Chairman rose and stated—That it was the unanimous opinion of the Board that the disputant holding the affirmative of any proposition should distinctively state that proposition; and when stated, that then it should be discussed distinctively, and that

all the arguments or demonstrations adduced should be connected with that single proposition, until nothing new could be offered—and when one of the propositions was thus discussed, the second should be treated in the same manner, and in the order stated. In the discussion of the great proposition, whether all religions are not founded in error, the Board would suggest that the discussion might be shortened by narrowing down the proposition, which could be done by substituting the word Christian and Jewish religions in the world. In this way, the party holding the negative, might bring all his arguments to bear upon that particular religion, which he wished to advocate. The Board have no idea of dictating in this matter, but they merely wish to suggest that the discussion might be shortened by narrowing the proposition as proposed.

To this suggestion of the Board, Mr. Owen replied—That to alter the nature of the discussion would be rather to increase the length of it. If, said he, I prove all religions to be erroneous, I prove the Christian religion to be founded in error.

Here Mr. Owen commenced reading his address.

You are not, however, to be blamed on this account, any more than the Cannibals, Gentoos or Pagans. You and they have been placed, from infancy, without your knowledge, will, or consent, within circumstances, not of your formation, which have made each what they are, and all are alike objects of deep commiseration to those who have been permitted to discover the thick darkness of error, which, at this day, vails the most valuable knowledge from men, and through ignorance thereof keeps them in sin and misery. And it is the universal belief, in these fables and doctrines, thus forced into the infant mind, that is now the only real obstacle to the formation of a society, over the earth, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, of unlimited sincerity, and of pure affection.

Hitherto, however, all governments, from the circumstances in which they have existed, have had but two primary objects to attain and secure. The first to keep the governed, or the great mass of the people, in the greatest possible ignorance of human nature, and the second to devise safe means by which the largest amount of their labor could be obtained from them for the use of the governing party. The first object has been always attained by the aid of the priesthood, who have been appointed to instruct the people in some of these fables and doctrines, which, however they may differ from or be opposed to, those taught in other countries, all governments agree to call *the true religion, derived immediately by some revelation or other, from their chief divinity or divinities.*

By these means the faculties of memory and imagination have been highly cultivated in those countries, which are deemed the most civilized, while the superior intellectual faculties, when applied to acquire a correct knowledge of human nature, have been held in no estimation; but, on the contrary, their cultivation for this purpose,

has been discouraged by every unfair means that cunning could invent and power apply.

And the success of these measures has been so complete, that in all countries, at this day, man is more ignorant of himself than of almost anything else by which he is surrounded.

Up to this period, however, no government could pursue any other course with safety or with the least prospect of being permanent. The circumstances did not exist to permit them to do it. For the population of the world must be governed by force, through their ignorance, or by great justice, intelligence, and good feelings.

There is no permanent stopping-place between these two extremes, and the best disposed governments have often felt this truth. Until now the knowledge and the means to govern a numerous population through intelligence and affection did not exist.

Previous to any successful attempt, it was necessary that experience should develop two sciences; first, the science of the influence of circumstances over human nature; the second, the science of the means of creating unlimited wealth, and of its equal distribution.

By the knowledge of these two sciences, properly applied to practice, all men may be easily taught and trained from infancy to become intelligent, independent, and happy, and to be governed without any difficulty, through their affections.

These two sciences are now known, sufficiently, to be applied, with success, to the population of all countries; and upon investigation, it will be found to be the interest of all governments to prepare the means, without delay, by which the people in their respective countries, may be taught this knowledge, in such a manner that all shall be benefited and none shall be injured.

By these measures being adopted, and openly and honestly made known to the public, all collision between the governments and people will be avoided; all attempts at future revolutions will cease; the governors and governed will be actively engaged in this good and great work; mutual confidence will be acquired, and peace and goodwill, will everywhere prevail.

Were any parties so ignorant of their own interest or happiness, as to desire to withhold this happy change from their fellow-beings, they could not now effect it except by an increase of the tyranny of the few over the many.

For the knowledge of these sciences has gone forth, never again to be recalled, or to become unknown, by any efforts man can make. It is now actively passing from mind to mind, and from country to country; and no human power can stay its course, until it shall pervade all countries and every mind.

Thus, as it appears to me, have I proved that all the religions of the world have originated in error; that they are directly opposed to the divine, unchanging laws of human nature; that they are necessarily the source of vice, disunion, and misery; that they are now the only obstacle to the formation of a society, over the earth, of

intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human race. And, also, that these district religions can be no longer maintained in any part of the world, except by the perpetuation of the ignorance of the mass of the people, and of the continued tyranny of the few over the many.

Mr. Owen having finished reading, he remarked, that—

In consequence of the remarks which had fallen from Mr. Campbell, it becomes necessary to state, generally, that in my opinion, it is perfectly useless to go into the examination of the verity of any or all the religions against which I am contending; for if I can show that man is a being entirely different from what all those religions assume him to be, I apprehend that I shall thereby prove all that is incumbent on me to establish. And I trust that I shall be able to show to this assembly, that man is a being to whom no religion, ever yet invented, can apply.

Mr. Campbell rose and said—

Before the discussion intermits, I should like to make a few remarks. I feel much interested in having this discussion brought to a satisfactory issue. Mr. Owen and myself have given birth to large and liberal expectations from this discussion. There are a great many persons who honestly doubt the truths of religion—and these honest skeptics, who are without sufficient evidence to determine their minds, have come hither with a view to be edified by the discussion. Surely then we have an object of great importance before us.—What now is our progress toward this great object? Mr. Owen read us an essay upon what he calls twelve matters of fact or divine laws of human nature.—Suppose now we were to admit all these twelve facts, does this admission oblige us to accede to all the laws and deductions he may superinduce on these facts?—by no means. Is Mr. Owen's loose declamation to settle or unsettle the faith of any one? Has he introduced either argument or proof? Who can say that he has? Nevertheless, it appears to me, that Mr. Owen really thinks he has established, in evidence, everything which he has undertaken to prove. I have a strong misgiving that Mr. Owen is about to give us a view or theory of the world, as foreign to the appropriate subject now before this meeting, as would be the history of a tour up the Ganges. I repeat, that there are in this assembly some doubting christians, that require to be confirmed, and some skeptics to be corrected. To the confirmation and conviction of such auditors, all our reasonings should tend. All this time I should have been proving or disproving some position bearing upon the great question at issue—Instead of this I must hear Mr. Owen reading upon a variety of topics having no legitimate bearing upon the subject matter before us.

During the recess before us, I could wish that the gentlemen moderators would agree upon some course, and compel us to pursue it. Shall I be permitted to speculate abstractly upon the possibility

or impossibility of any human being in any age, having the power to invent any religion? Will it be in order, for me to introduce some affirmative propositions in case Mr. Owen proceeds to read, as he has done, essays upon human nature, civil government, or a new order of political society? I think I am able to prove that man cannot invent any, even the most extravagant religion in the world. In all religions I conceive that there are certain ideas, for the invention of which, man viewed philosophically, cannot be supposed to possess any powers. Shall I be at liberty to prove this by facts equal in strength, to say the least of them, to any one of those on which Mr. Owen would found his theory of human nature? I merely ask for permission to take this course on condition that Mr. Owen refuses to be confined to the discussion of his own propositions. If I am permitted to take this course, I will attempt, to demonstrate that man is in possession of powers never developed—never even glanced at, in any one of Mr. Owen's twelve divine laws. I will endeavor to show that in all religions there are ideas, terms and phrases so supernatural that no human mind could originate them, according to any system of philosophy taught in the world. If this permission cannot logically be granted, according to the stipulated rules of the discussion, I ask to what part of Mr. Owen's address am I to reply? For I do confess that Mr. Owen has not presented to my mind anything for it to take hold of, having any argumentative bearing upon any one of his five positions. I confess myself too obtuse to discover the logical bearing of what he has read. I hope upon his first position we shall be able in the afternoon to take up the subject in a more logical form. For I am now determined to present, with your permission, to this audience such a body of evidence as shall put it out of the power of any honest inquirer to doubt the truth and divine origin of christianity.

Here Mr. Campbell stated that the time had expired, and moved an adjournment, which was carried.

Afternoon.—The Hon. *Chairman* rose and stated, that the Moderators had felt it their duty to re-examine the challenge given, and the acceptance.—We find, said he, that the challenge contains five distinct propositions, separately stated. The first is, that all religions had been founded in ignorance. It is the opinion of the Moderators that the discussion, this afternoon, ought to be confined to that proposition, until the subject is exhausted. Then the second proposition should be taken up. It is therefore expected that the discussion, this afternoon, will be founded on, and confined to, this first proposition, viz: "that all religions are founded in ignorance."

Mr. Campbell stated to the Chairman that Mr. Owen wished to be informed when his half hour expired.

Mr. Owen rose with the Christian Baptist in his hand containing the particulars of the challenge and acceptance, and continued his address.

My friends, I am now here to prove that all the religions ever known from the beginning of time till the present hour, have origi-

nated in the general and universal ignorance of mankind. I conclude that, to do this at this period would be unnecessary, if men had been taught to know what manner of beings they were, how they were formed at birth, and how their characters were afterward produced for them. Had this knowledge been born with man, it would have been impossible that any one of these religions could have existed for one hour. I shall endeavor to show that man is a being entirely different from what he has been supposed to be by any religion ever invented, and that none of these religions apply in any degree to a being formed as man is. And to prove this we require the aid of no authority derived from testimony from the darkest ages of ignorance, from a period of the world when no reliance can be placed upon any doubtful testimony. We have, on the contrary, only to appeal to ourselves and the facts which exist here at this moment, which exist wherever human beings can be found. I have stated as a fundamental law of human nature that man, at birth, is ignorant of everything relative to his own organization—that he has not been permitted to create any part of his faculties, qualities or powers, physical or mental. Now if we are so formed that we have not any kind of will or control in the formation of ourselves; of our physical propensities; of our intellectual and physical qualities; surely we cannot be held responsible for what they have been made for us. How can an infant be made responsible for that of which it was entirely ignorant? Any religion, therefore, which presupposes man bad by nature, must surely be founded in utter ignorance of human nature. I do not imagine it to be necessary to take up much of your time in proving that an infant at birth is quite incapable of knowing anything about his organization or natural capabilities. And yet his character and conduct proceed essentially from them; they are the only foundation of his virtues and vices. Over the formation of these, however, he has had no control, nor in the forming of anything that belongs to himself. No being, therefore, so created can ever be made to become responsible for his nature. It is said there is a difference between men—and this is true; for some are evidently created superior and some inferior in certain natural qualities; but whether inferior or superior, they were not designed or executed by the individuals possessing them, and they cannot therefore, deserve merit or demerit for having them, or be made, without great injustice, responsible for them. Every parent, and every individual who has the power of observation, know that there are no two persons born precisely alike; that there is almost every kind of variety in the formation of the human being at birth. They know also that the individuals themselves could not make the smallest part of this difference, that the children could have no influence whatever in giving to themselves what are called good or bad, superior or inferior qualities. Let us suppose two infants, one the best, and one the worst, in nature. As neither could make himself, what are we to say respecting each? shall we praise the one and blame the

other? shall we make each responsible for the conduct that must flow from these two different organizations, if left to themselves without culture? I repeat, did either infant make his propensities weak or strong, superior or inferior? If not, if there ought to be any difference in our conduct toward these infants as they grow to maturity, it ought to be shown in our greater commiseration for the inferior; this ought to be the feeling which all should possess, and which all will possess when they shall understand what manner of beings they are. If one of our species be made inferior to the other, it is our duty and our interest not only to commiserate him, but to endeavor to remedy the defect of his nature; and when we shall know ourselves we shall so act, because no other conduct will appear to us to be rational. Well, then, if the infant at birth did not make himself, and if the difference discoverable between infants was not made by themselves, surely we cannot say that the infant is responsible either for the one or the other. I feel it unnecessary to take more time to prove the truth of these two laws or the obvious deductions which every one who reflects must draw from them. And if these things be as I have stated, all religions are founded in error, for their dogmas are in direct opposition to these self-evident truths and the deductions made from them. These laws of our nature, then, must be erroneous or all religions are untrue and founded in ignorance. The third divine law of our nature is, that each individual is placed at birth, without his knowledge or consent, within the influence of circumstances which operate irresistibly upon his peculiar organization; and these circumstances thus stamp their own general character upon the infant and the man; yet the influence of these circumstances is modified by the peculiar organization of the individual subjected to them. Now I do not suppose that it will be necessary to enter into any very elaborate argument to prove this law.

Is there, I ask, in this varied assembly, composed of individuals born in so many different and distant countries, one individual who can say that he determined the period *when* he should be born, of *whom*, in *what* country, and who should be his instructor? Did any of you determine which of all the religions of the world you should be taught to believe, or whether you should be born a prince or a peasant? Whether you should be well or ill educated, according to our ideas of education? Or is there any one here who can suppose it possible that he has ever had the slightest control over any one of these circumstances? Many individuals of this audience have been born in very different parts of Europe and America, and have unavoidably received their local impressions accordingly. But suppose we had all been born among a tribe of thorough-going cannibals, would we not, in that case, have been sure to have experienced great delight in killing and eating our enemies? But if we had been taken soon after our birth to India, and taught to become Gentoos, how many of us could have resisted acquiring a character that would have compelled us to shudder with horror even at the idea of injuring a fly? Probably

not one in this assembly—I imagine no one will doubt it; and if true; does it not prove beyond all doubt that we are not the formers of our own character; that we are beings irresponsible for what we are—irresponsible for our feelings, opinions, and conduct? Does it not prove that we are the *effects of causes irresistible* in their *influence?* Who among us decided that he should be taught to speak English, be instructed in the christian religion and belong to his particular sect? If we had happened to have been born in the great circle of Mahomedanism, what would have been our character compared with what it now is? And it is not our fault or our merit that this was not our lot in life. No, my friends, we are to all intents the effects of causes to us irresistible; and when we shall be taught to know what manner of beings we are, this will be to us the most inestimable of all knowledge, it will enable us to open a road for the removal of all the poverty, ignorance, disunion, vice, and crime which everywhere abound; it will moreover open a direct road to enable us to act upon the rising generation in such a manner that there shall not be one individual trained to remain inferior in society. We shall discover a mathematical mode of training the rising generation, by which they shall be prevented from receiving one error, one bad habit, or acquiring one injurious passion. Yes, this knowledge of ourselves will lead us to know precisely how all this is to be accomplished, and speedily too. But it will effect yet more; it will render it utterly impossible for one human being to become angry with another, or to feel any irritation or displeasure toward any one. All our irritation against our fellow-men arises from our entire ignorance of what manner of beings we all are. Where is there any just cause for anger among men? Does my brother differ from me in language, color, religion, or manners? Did he decide upon the formation of any one of these? Does he, in consequence, differ from me in habits, feelings, conduct? Was he the framer or is he the controller of these feelings, habits, and conduct? No, these have all been forced upon him in like manner as mine have upon me. And whenever we shall become only slightly rational, there will be no longer either anger, or irritation, or opposition, or disunion, among the human family. Are not the principles which can produce these results deserving our most serious investigation? When they shall be fully developed and well understood, there will be no longer any doubt or uncertainty as to the proper conduct to pursue in all the affairs of life. No fanciful notions under the name of any religion will be permitted to divide man from man and render the whole race irrational and miserable. In your commercial proceedings an entire change will take place. A knowledge of the best interests of society will introduce a new practice and supersede all attempts to buy cheap and sell dear. There will be no more covert enmity among those who are now by their training and education endeavoring to grasp at, and monopolize all benefits to themselves. Then the heart and the hand will be always open; then there will be no necessity for

any one to spend all his time and exert all his faculties to provide the means of existence for himself and family, while those who do nothing, or worse than nothing, live upon his labor. This grievous evil will altogether cease. The fundamental principle of human nature stated this forenoon was, "that each individual at birth is so organized that in infancy he is liable to imbibe false and injurious notions, etc., or their opposites, and to retain them with great tenacity." In proof of this we have only to notice the details of the measures by which sects and parties and conditions of mankind are formed and produced. They are compelled to receive the impressions from the persons and circumstances around them; and after the mental and physical habits have been some time formed, they then often cannot part with them again, except by much labor and suffering. Man has heretofore been a mere passive subject, obliged to receive any impressions which have been made upon his senses; and whatever they may be, whether good or bad, true or false, they are not the impressions, correctly speaking, of the individual, but solely the influence of external circumstances acting upon an organization, which he had no hand in framing and which he does not understand, and for which, therefore, it would be an act of the greatest injustice to reward or punish.

We have been taught so much error, and have gone, in consequence, so far astray, that it will be a considerable time before our ideas can be made consistent and rational; but when this shall be done it will be discovered that there exists no cause in nature why any human being should suppress the expression of sensations which he has been compelled to receive. When we shall know ourselves truth only will be the language of mankind. Neither young nor old, male nor female, will then discover any reason why they should not speak their thoughts and feelings as their nature compels them to receive them.

It is man's ignorance of his nature that has alone produced falsehood; all the falsehood that has ever existed in the world emanates directly and alone from this source. The religions of the world prevent men from investigating the laws of nature; they give quite a different direction to men's thoughts, and render them unfit to commence a calm and unprejudiced investigation of themselves. "Know thyself," was the most valuable precept that ever ancient or modern oracle has delivered. And when we shall all be taught to know ourselves, then, and then only, can the world become intelligent, virtuous and happy. There is nothing to prevent the immediate commencement of a very superior and happy state of society but the present universal ignorance of mankind of themselves. When you retire from this meeting, you may be assured, there is no subject which can occupy your thoughts at all comparable in importance to the serious investigation of what you yourselves are. This is a subject that would be fairly open to every one except for the early prepossessions which have been imbibed. When you shall be released

from the errors upon this subject that all religions have been forced into the human mind you will be relieved from a state of darkness of which now you have not the means of forming any adequate conception. Now, indeed. you see nothing as it is; you see only as through a glass darkly, and a glass so dark that no rays of pure light can pass through it.

MR. CAMPBELL'S THIRD REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—We shall again indulge ourselves in a few general strictures upon the data before us. With regard to the terms in which Mr. Owen has concluded his first position, we have a few remarks to offer. Mr. Owen distinctly asserts that all religions are founded in ignorance. Whether this be a recommendation or disparagement of all religions is a question of doubtful decision from the words of the position. Let us try this position with a reference to our existing institutions: All schools and colleges have been founded and established on the ignorance of man; all testimony has been established on the ignorance of man; all the books that have ever been printed are founded upon the ignorance of man! Are not these facts? But does the existence of these facts cast any opprobrium, obloquy, or disparagement upon books, human testimony, or seminaries of instruction?—These terms, then, have nothing in their nature or import calculated to engender a prejudice against religion.

I do believe that all religion is founded upon ignorance, using that term according to its legitimate import. And this very consideration proves the necessity of religion. If men were perfectly intelligent with regard to the relations in which they stand to matter, spirit, a future state, etc., there would be no occasion for the institution of any sort of religion. "If," saith a distinguished writer, "our reason were always clear and perfect, unruffled by passion, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by disease or intemperance, we should need no other guide, in physics or in morals, but the light of nature. But every man finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt and his understanding full of ignorance and error; and hence is derived to us the necessity of an immediate and direct revelation. If, then, men need a religion at all, they need it because of their ignorance. It was instituted to remove human ignorance, and the necessity of supernatural revelation has ever been founded upon that ignorance. The difficulties my friend, Mr. Owen, presents on the subject of human responsibility, are of no ordinary magnitude. The most profound philosophers of ancient and modern times, have all differed upon this knotty point: "How far does necessity affect human character?" But Mr. Owen's argument ascribes everything to an irresistible necessity; which necessity, after all, is the operation of a blind and undesigning nature. But let us admit, for the sake of argument, that we could not trace how far we are the creatures of necessity; suppose we were to fail in showing how far we are irresistibly influenced by extrinsic causes, would this failue, I

ask, be sufficient to discredit the whole body of evidence which establishes the truth of christianity? How many necessarians are there who believe in supernatural revelation? I know that we may fall so deeply in love with a favorite idea, that our passion may transport us far beyond the limits of common sense and sober reason. But if we are to be governed by common sense, in objects of sense, let us learn a lesson from the experience we have of our liability to err, even when we have the evidence of sense. Errors may exist on subjects of sensible demonstration, which though discoverable by the senses, often elude detection. It is an axiom in mathematics, that two parallel lines, though projected *ad infinitum*, can never meet in one point. Now this is certainly and evidently true. But where is the man living, who, by his eye, or by the aid of the most perfect glasses, can, at one glance, decide whether any seemingly parallels are perfectly mathematical parallels? You might draw them out to a great length, and yet they might not seem to approximate; but it is still possible that, if sufficiently projected, they might at some remote point, form an angle. How hazardous, then, with our imperfect vision, to affirm that any two lines are perfectly parallel. And yet this is a sensible object, and an object of which we take cognizance by the most perfect and discriminating of all our senses. Now we all confess that there are inherent difficulties in the ascertainment of abstract metaphysical truths, much more difficult to overcome than those difficulties which appertain to sensible objects. As, then, our mental vision is still more imperfect than our corporeal vision, does it become us at once to decide, with an air of infallibility, a question purely abstract, or to affirm that, in comparing two abstract ideas, they do, or do not agree? How much more irrational to establish a whole system of skepticism upon a dogma of one metaphysical school, which is more difficult to apprehend than the parallelism of two given straight lines, seemingly running in the same direction? Now when two lines, seemingly parallel, are presented to my eye, and I cannot decide by a mere glance of the eye, there are other means of deciding such a question, which cannot be applied to a question purely metaphysical; for there are no scale nor dividers by which we can actually measure the agreement or disagreement of abstract ideas. If now, in sensible objects, such difficulties may, and do occur, would it be common sense in me to conclude that an abstract metaphysical position is at variance with experience and common sense, because I cannot set about to prove or disprove it as I would set about to prove or disprove the perfect parallelism of two mathematical lines?

If we are not able to draw the line of demarcation between necessity and free agency, are we therefore to upset all the experience of man in relation to the existence of a God, of a spiritual world, a future state, and everything connected with the christian religion?

But we have facts and arguments to prove that, to a very considerable extent, we are not the pure creatures of circumstances. My

opponent is himself a living refutation of his own doctrine. He was born in Great Britain, consequently was bred in a state of society very different from that which he is so anxious to induce. Now the question is, Did his early circumstances make him such a man as he is, or originate those ideas which he is now divulging through Europe and America? He ascribes everything to circumstances. But he talks of happiness. Now let me ask, Has he ever seen such a set of circumstances as would make a man perfectly happy? How did he come by his peculiar ideas? They are the creatures not of circumstances, but of a warm and overheated imagination. This he may never see, owing to the obduracy of that hard-hearted necessity which presides over his destiny. I am willing to make very ample concessions to the doctrine of circumstances. It is a very specious and plausible doctrine, and many honest minds have been deceived by its plausibility. The curious and absurd intellectual aberrations, the strange mental hallucinations of philosophy and system-mongers are unaccountable. Hobbs reasoned himself into a perfect conviction that there was no such thing as right or wrong—that there was no moral difference in actions. Hume convinced himself that there was nothing else in the world but ideas and impressions. Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, thoroughly persuaded himself that matter did not exist; and he framed a beautiful and ingenious theory, of the fallacy of which there was no convincing him. Reed, in his *Essay on the Human Mind*, states that some of the old philosophers (philosophists I should call them) went so far as to doubt of their own existence. Descartes was one of these. He would not believe in his own existence until he had proved it to his own satisfaction. And how think you did he prove it? Why, said he, *Cogito, ego sum.* Now this was proof, just as illogical as if he had said, 'I have an eye or an ear, and therefore I am.' Yet this proof satisfied his mind. It is said of Pyrrho, the father of the Elean Philosophy, that so incredulous was he in the testimony of his senses, that he would not get out of the way of any danger, however imminent; that his friends had to take him out of the way of danger; for he would not turn away from the brink of a precipice. But there is no stopping-place to such philosophical reveries. It is not strange that Mr. Owen should diverge so far from the beaten track of common sense. Many philosophers have done so before him, some of them have gone still farther than he. His case is by no means singular.

I am quite willing to allow that there is great speciousness in the doctrine of necessity. This we may yet find necessary to expose. I am willing to concede many of Mr. Owen's points; such as, We cannot help being born black or white; we cannot choose the period or place of our birth, nor control the circumstances of our nature and education. But does it follow, as a logical conclusion, that because all men did not create themselves, *ergo*, all religions are founded in ignorance. This would seem to be the logical tendency of Mr. Owen's ratiocinations. Godwin, a highly gifted writer, runs at

dom pretty much after the same fashion ; but he was constrained to stop some miles on this side of materialism. An insuperable difficulty occurred to him in the doctrine of causation. Godwin, in his reasonings on causation, discovered that it was impossible for him to ascertain what degree of power *thought* exercised over the movements of matter. After exploring the whole area of materialism, and the popular doctrine of necessity, he discovered that it was most philosophic to make the following confessions, or concessions : —

*" Of the origin of the faculty of thought, we are wholly uninformed. It is far from certain, that the phenomenon of motion can anywhere exist where there is no thought. The motions of the animal and vegetable systems is the most inexplicable of all motions, simple or complex. Thought appears to be the medium of operation in the material system. The materialists make thought the effect of matter or motion impressing us ; but are not these effects again causes ? Consequently thought becomes the cause of the movements and changes of matter. We are universally unable to discover the ground of necessary connection. It is possible that, as a numerous class of motions have their constant origin in thought ; so there may be no thoughts altogether unattended with motion. There are but two ways in which thought can be excited in the mind — 1st, by external impressions ; and, 2dly, by the property which one thought, existing in the mind, is found to have of introducing another, by some link unknown."**

These cardinal points, dimly apprehended, saved him from the vortex of materialism, and afford some wholesome admonitions to our modern wise men who are dressing up anew the long-exploded doctrines of fate and materialism.

But to return to the doctrine of circumstances, we have proof, deduced from the experience of every man, that we are not always controlled by the circumstances around us.

Do we not originate new ideas, giving birth to new systems ? Carry the influences of circumstances, according to Mr. Owen's doctrine, out to its legitimate consequences, and we must cease to be progressive beings—there's a stop put to our progressive improvability. But it behooves Mr. Owen, before he can establish the truth of his positions, to account for a variety of principles in human nature, in direct opposition to his whole theory. Of these we shall hereafter speak.

I have been very much pleased with the perusal of my friend's "twelve fundamental laws of human nature," which he handed me during the intermission. I have very little objection to any of them, save that which undertakes to settle the amount of influence which the will exercises over our belief. But this is a question which I am not about to agitate at present. But the admission of Mr. Owen's "facts" does not involve an admission of all the reasonings and de-

* Godwin, vol. i, p. 404—420.

ductions superinduced upon them. But these very "facts" demonstrate that Mr. Owen has lost sight of the creature man, and of the relations in which he exists and acts. He never takes into view the intellectual endowments of man. No analysis of the powers or capabilities of the human mind has been attempted. 'Tis the mere animal, the external case, which is the mere habitation of the intelligent principle, which engrosses his whole thought and theory. All that Mr. Owen has said of man, might, with the same logical propriety, be affirmed of a goat. There is scarcely one of these twelve laws that is not as true of the irrational part of the animal creation as it is of man. According to these "divine laws of human nature," man is as effectually deprived of all data whereon to form a judgment, or even a conjecture concerning his primitive origin or future destiny, as is the horse or dog. Now in laying the foundation of any science or theory regarding the nature of man, we must take into view the whole premises, as well in relation to mind as matter—to things future as to things present. Every rational theory on the nature of man must be predicated, *de rebus spiritualibus*, as well as *de rebus naturalibus*—upon his spiritual, as well as his natural endowments; otherwise a theory predicated of only a part of man, must be defective, and at variance with all experience.

Errors of this kind are very common among theorists. Each of them has some favorite principle, by which he resolves everything, and to which all his reasonings tend. But every rational theory of man must be founded upon a strict analysis of the whole man, moral and physical—upon an analysis of his mental endowments as well as his physical faculties—upon an analysis of everything pertaining to the man, soul, body, and spirit. But these "twelve facts" only prove that all our ideas are the result of mere sensation—that they are acquired, accumulated, and imposed by the influence of external circumstances.

We may yet examine whether such a theory can be predicated of the principles alleged. Locke, Hume, and all the mental philosophers, have agreed upon certain premises. Mirabeau himself agrees with Locke and Hume. They all agree that all our original ideas are the result of sensation and reflection; that is, that the five senses inform us of the properties of bodies, that our five senses are the only avenues through which ideas of material objects can be derived to us; that we have an intellectual power of comparing these impressions thus derived to us through the media of the senses: and this they call reflection. Admitting this theory to be correct (Mr. Owen has doubted it); but if it be correct that all our simple ideas are the result of sensation and reflection, how can we have any idea, the archetype of which does not exist in nature?

But the question is, whence are the ideas, which we call religious, derived to us? Neither our sensations, impressions, nor their combinations, have ever been able to shadow out an archetype of a God or Creator producing something out of nothing. All our ideas

concerning creative power have exclusive reference to changes wrought upon created matter. From the preceding sketch the idea of changing a shapeless piece of wood into a chair, is easily derived to us—it is simply an idea of a change wrought upon the raw material, that being created to the hand of the maker. But we have an idea of God, of a Creator, a being who has produced the whole material universe by the bare exhibition of physical creative power. This idea, we contend, can have no archetype in nature, because we have never seen anything produced out of nothing. But we have the idea of the existence of this creative power. It is to be found in almost all religions. If we appeal to traditionary or historic evidence, we shall find that all nations had originally some ideas of the existence of a Great First Cause. But the difficulty is—how did the idea originate? By what process could it have been engendered? Where was the archetype in nature to suggest (consistently with the analysis of the human mind) the remotest idea of a Creator, or any other idea concerning spiritual things? Locke and Hume admit the almost unbounded power of the imagination. It can abstract, compound, and combine the qualities of objects already known, and thus form new creations *ad infinitum*. But still it borrows all the original qualities from the other faculties of the mind, and from the external senses. Imagination can roam at large upon the properties of animals, and by abstracting from one and adding to another, and thus combining their respective qualities, it creates to itself images unlike anything existing in nature. Hence the Centaur, the Sphinx, and the Griffin. But our ideas of all the constituents of these creatures of imagination are derived from our senses and reflections. There is no limit to its vagaries; for as the poet says, *it can most easily convert a bush into a bear*. But a man, some say, may imagine the idea of a First Cause, and may originate spiritual ideas. But this is impossible from anything yet known in experience or in philosophy. To form ideas concerning spiritual things, imagination has to travel out of her province. To form the very first idea of a God, she must transcend the visible material world. Nothing so fantastic as the vagaries of imagination, and yet nothing is more circumscribed. My imagination might picture to me a tree, the roots of which are *iron*, the stem *brass*, the leaves *silver*, and the apples *gold;* but if I had never seen a tree growing in the earth, could I possibly have conceived, in the wildest vagaries of my imagination, an idea of this wonderful metallic tree? I therefore conceive that it devolves upon Mr. Owen (in deducing his proofs of the first position, that "all religions are founded in the ignorance of man") to show that we possess those powers which can enable us to reason from sensible material objects up to spiritual, immaterial existences. It behooves him to show that ignorant men, or men in the rudest ages of the world, were competent to invent and establish religion. If it be so that man is destitute of power to create something out of nothing, or to originate the fundamental ideas and

terms found in all religions—if he cannot clear up this matter, how can he affirm that all religion is founded upon the ignorance of men? But this is not all: there are a few questions which I now beg leave distinctively to propose to my opponent for his consideration. I will furnish him with a copy of them for his examination during the evening, that on the morrow he may see the necessity of going more philosophically to work, if he intend to debate the points at issue at all:—

1. Can man, by the exercise of his mental powers, originate language? And even suppose he could invent names for external sensible objects, could he also originate the terms peculiar to religion, for which he has no types in the sensible creation?

2. Must not the object or idea exist prior to the name or term by which it is designated? For example, the term "steamboat," a word invented in our time—was not the object in existence before this name was found in our vocabulary?

3. Must not the idea of the existence of any particular object, be prior to the idea of any of its properties? Or can we conceive of the properties of a thing, before we have an idea of that thing's existence.

4. How, then, do we become conscious of the idea of spirit, our consciousness being limited to the objects of sensation, perception, and memory; and, consequently, all our mental operation being necessarily confined to the same objects?

5. Does not our belief, as well as our knowledge and experience, depend upon our mental operations?

I choose to present the matter in this form in order to elicit from my opponent something like an analysis of the powers of the human mind, which we must have soon or late in this controversy, if either of us will redeem the pledge we have given to this community.

MR. OWEN'S FOURTH ADDRESS.

Gentlemen moderators—You decided yesterday evening, that the part of the subject to be continued by me, was to prove that all religions have been founded in ignorance. It was, I believe, so stated by the Chairman.

I last night received some questions from my friend, Mr. Campbell; but discovering that they are not applicable to the subject matter immediately before us, we will postpone the consideration of them until I have demonstrated the five propositions which I have engaged to prove. Afterward, I will, if time permit, discuss any metaphysical question, however subtile. But as you, gentlemen, have decided that we shall proceed to investigate the points agreed upon between Mr. Campbell and myself, I feel bound to abide by your decision.

My friends, I yesterday pursued this point through four of the fundamental laws, upon which I rely to prove all I have undertaken to do in this engagement with Mr. Campbell. I will now proceed to the

fifth, viz: "That each individual is so created, at birth, that he may be compelled to receive true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and retain them with great tenacity." This is one of the fundamental laws of human nature, which may properly be called a divine law; no man created it; no man knows how it was created; it exists in man at all times, wherever he may be found; it is beyond man's control; and I conceive that that which is beyond human control, to be truly divine, if anything can be so called. If, then, it be a law of our nature, that infants may be so placed, that, without the possibility of resistance, on their parts, they may be compelled to receive rational ideas or false notions; they cannot be responsible for what they are thus made to receive, without their consent. When we look at the countenance of those who have been born and reared in very inferior circumstances of life—of those wholly devoid of education, we discover at once their ignorance, before they speak. The expression of their countenances assures us, before a word is spoken, that they are devoid of intelligence. We perceive that their training and instruction have been entirely neglected. Are these men to be responsible for the neglect which they have experienced? On the other hand, let us observe the countenances of intelligent, well educated men, and we shall be compelled to draw the conclusion, that they have been educated amidst circumstances comparatively favorable for the development of their mental faculties. But can these individuals deserve merit for being so placed? Surely man has always been in error on these subjects. The character of the varied circumstances in which they were placed, from infancy, is stamped upon the expression and features of both. They were made what they are, by measures adopted by persons over whom they had no control, and by a power of which they were ignorant.

My friends, whenever you shall consider these things, rationally, you will discover that not one of the religions which has ever been invented, or forced upon mankind, apply to a being who is thus organized. Fortunately, for our posterity, we have now discovered that we are so created that the adults of this or any subsequent generation may form the characters of their successors, to attain high physical and mental excellence; and through this knowledge we shall soon learn to do justice to human nature. We shall not continue as we have heretofore done, to find fault with human nature, because our parents have allowed us to be trained in all kinds of ignorance and bad feeling. No, we shall discover that we are the effects of causes as certain and known, as any effects that ever man traced up to the known and ascertained causes.

When we shall learn to know ourselves; when we shall no longer remain in ignorance of what manner of beings we are; then, and then only, shall we know how to estimate the value and importance of a human being at birth; they will be no longer neglected in infancy. We shall be conscious of the necessity which exists, to give

the greatest attention to the formation of their ideas, habits, and characters, from the commencement of their existence. Then we shall discover the certain method whereby to make our infants the most superior of human beings—superior in ideas, in habits, in manners, in disposition, and in morals—superior in everything calculated to improve the condition of society. If, however, these new arrangements were now in the full tide of successful experiment; if they were now even actually consummated, and their happy effects experienced, I would not conscientiously attribute one particle of praise or blame to the individuals who had been the most prominent agents in bringing about such a revolution. No, my friends, we might, with equal justice, attribute merit to the coat which I now wear, because it is black, as to the individual to whose lot it may fall to bring about this new order of things. We can paint any infant black or white, in character, by our care or neglect; but who shall blame or praise the infant for what others perform for him, and not err? No; when once the full truth upon this subject shall be understood and appreciated, all irrational praise and blame, all those unkind feelings, which the present system generates, will no longer exist; there will not be a single motive for a harsh feeling among the whole race. Why, my friends, we have been told—and that truly, too—that the greatest of all virtues is charity. But what kind of charity? Is it a charity for those who happen to be placed in like circumstances with ourselves? Is it a charity for our own particular sect or party? No; the character which is required to form this virtue, can be derived only from this knowledge of ourselves, and through this knowledge it will become irresistible and universal; it will be a pure, unalloyed charity, extending to the whole human race. Compare now this charity, which excludes not one human being that has ever been born, with the charity that now exists in the world. And why has not this charity been coeval with our race? Why, simply, because, from the beginning of time, we have been kept in the dark; because all manner of foul play has been employed to make and to keep us irrational, and to prevent us from knowing anything about ourselves.

Whenever a spirit more ardent than that belonging to the ordinary race of mortals, attempted an investigation of moral and social diseases, there has ever been a government and a priesthood at hand to say to them in a voice of thunder, "Trespass not upon our prerogatives; advance not one step in that direction without *our* permission; know you not that the people *must* be kept in the dark?" But, my friends, how beautiful are the simple truths of nature! They require no preaching, Sunday after Sunday, year after year, generation after generation, to prove that they are true. A half dozen sermons upon religion and morals, would be quite sufficient to enlighten all who might hear them. This plan of proceeding would certainly save a great expense of time and money, and be a great gain in many important points of view to the public. But do

not suppose that I wish to excite one angry feeling against the priesthood. They are a class, formed like all other classes, by the circumstances of the societies in which they live, and are no more culpable than any other portion of any other society. I have several friends, whom I highly esteem, who are ministers, not of *one* but of *all* the sects generally known in Europe—men whom I believe to be strictly conscientious; and with some of these in particular I live on terms of great intimacy, and feel a great regard and affection for them personally. I have two brothers-in-law who are christian ministers, and we have always had a sincere friendship for each other. I cannot blame them or other ministers of religion for being made what they are. I feel the injustice of attributing to any of them individually the errors of their sects, or the evils which they create. The responsibility which I have assumed in my continued earnest endeavors to subvert all the religions of the world, and thereby deprive many individuals of their present only mode of support, has been always one of serious consideration. It has occupied much of my thoughts. I have been most anxious to discover a safe and secure mode to prevent priests, lawyers, physicians, or merchants being injured personally by the change, in mind, body, or estate. I know that the time has now arrived when this change (tremendous as it may and must appear to those who are not prepared for it) must take place; and take place too rapidly, my friends, unless we can beforehand infuse so much charity as to prompt us to the adoption of the means by which the present individuals in these classes may be supported as long as they live. But I am not without consolation even upon this subject. The peculiar circumstances in which I have been placed, (circumstances which I may hereafter explain, if necessary,) enable me to state confidently that the time has passed when it is *necessary* to have any contest about the means of living in comfort, or about any pecuniary consideration. The enormous scientific power obtained within the last half century for the creation of wealth, with the increase of knowledge upon many other important subjects, will change men's minds on these matters and introduce a principle of justice instead of the practice of gain. The public may be expected to become rational on these subjects, and be enabled to guide these two powers to produce a general benefit for all classes. When these powers are developed, they will be found amply sufficient to secure to every child, from birth to death, a full supply of everything really beneficial for his nature, or that can contribute to his happiness. As we advance in real knowledge, and thus become rational, we shall discover that there can be no cause for anxiety, with regard to pecuniary matters, or rather the means of living in comfort. We shall perceive that, with the ample means now possessed by society, arrangements the most simple and beautiful may be created to produce a superfluity of real wealth for the whole society, so abundant, indeed, that we may all freely use as much as we

desire—even then there will be a surplus, greatly exceeding the wants of all.

My friends, do not suppose that these are chimerical notions, unwarranted by fact. They may be easily explained and demonstrated to be truths, by facts, the most valuable to mankind, and capable, when rightly applied, to make the most happy results for the generations to come. This beneficial change is as certain to arrive through the necessary progress of improvement and advance of knowledge, as that you now hear the sound of my voice. These must be the necessary results of this law of our nature, when understood and acted upon in connection with the other laws; and I think Mr. Campbell has admitted the accuracy of them all, except the one that declares our wills to have no power to change our convictions or to force any belief on our minds, contrary to the strongest conviction already made upon them. But, my friends, this law of our nature promulgates a self-evident truth. If man is thus plastic, in childhood, shall we not adopt the same method of moulding them into beings who shall be virtuous, and consequently, happy themselves, and dispensers of happiness to others? Why, with a knowledge of this law, shall one inferior human being be hereafter formed? There is surely no necessity for it—not even that one discordant disposition should be formed, to mar the general happiness. My friends, do you not already perceive how much we should all be benefited, if there were no inferior characters among us.

We come now to the *sixth* fundamental principle of human nature which my friend Mr. Campbell says he is not quite willing to subscribe to. Now, my friends, I should be sorry to leave anything even doubtful or unsettled, either in your minds or my friend Mr. Campbell's. To establish the truth of this divine law of our nature it is only necessary to adduce facts which every one can comprehend, and must assent to.

Therefore, I trust, that before we separate, not only my friend Mr. Campbell, but every reflecting person here will admit the truth of this law. This 6th law then (which appears to be the present stumbling block) is "that each individual is so created, that he must believe according to the strongest impressions made upon his feelings and faculties, and that his belief in no case depends upon his will." If the human race had not been involved in ignorance, the most gross, and if that ignorance had not been continued up to the present hour, no one could have imagined for a moment that he had the power of belief, or disbelief, at his control.

We are beings so formed by nature, that we are compelled, often strongly against our wills, to believe what we do not desire to believe; to be convinced of that which we have not any inclination to believe, and what we never expect to believe. If any of you now suppose, that you have the power to believe or disbelieve, according to your volitions, be so good as to believe for a few

moments, that I am not here; can any of you do this? But it may be said, that this is a fact, so clear, that we cannot disbelieve it against the evidence of our senses. Well, then, will you have the goodness to control your wills, to believe fully and unreservedly that Mahomet was a true prophet sent of God? Now, is there an individual here, who has been able so far to influence his will, as to believe in the divinity of Mahomet's mission? I know that this is impossible. And so it is, my friends, in all the other departments of human belief and opinions. Whenever the human mind shall be rescued from the thick darkness which has heretofore enveloped it, no proposition will be more self-evident, than that our will has no control over our belief and opinions. Whether born in China or Hindostan; among Christians or Jews—whether in India or in Africa—all men are coerced by this and other laws of our nature to believe according to the strongest impressions which the circumstances of birth, nature, and education have forced upon them. And, my friends, are you aware that this error, taught us from infancy, that our will has power over our belief, is the main pillar of all religions? They have indeed no other foundation; and you perceive it is quicksand only. Be assured, there never has been a more injurious idea forced into the human mind than that which has forced it to believe that there is merit or demerit in any opinion whatsoever. We can give to all children true ideas or false notions; for in this respect they are perfectly passive. And, indeed, in the universal ignorance of this plain, simple truth, is to be found the chief cause of all the massacres, wars, dissensions, and miseries which have afflicted the human race, and the lamentable want of that pure and unrestricted charity, which ought to pervade the population of all countries. When, however, we shall be taught to understand, and thereby made cordially to receive this truth, how delightfully shall we communicate with each other; then, my friends, we shall no longer be angry in the slightest degree, because our brother has been placed in circumstances which coerce him to think differently from ourselves. We shall then perceive that there is quite as much rationality in being angry with him, because his opinions do not accord with ours, as there would be in being angry with him because his features are not exactly like ours. No, my friends, it is just as absurd for us to form our brethren, to think as we do, without producing evidence sufficient to create conviction in their minds, as it would be to force every one of them to be six feet high. We can establish a uniform standard for men's height, with as much color of rationality, as we can for their opinions. No man can alter his opinion, by his own will. We must, before such a change can be made, receive from some new source reasons sufficient to create a conviction stronger than that by which he has been previously influenced. It is true, as my learned friend will perhaps say, that men may be more inclined to open their minds, to receive, or to be confirmed in one set of opinions, and to neglect the means of acquiring,

or close their minds against receiving some other opinions, which they have been taught to believe, are erroneous, and injurious; but our motives for so doing, exist in our minds independently of our wills. We have been in such cases previously prejudiced in favor of, or against, these opinions. Some wills were necessarily formed by these prejudices, and we could no more avoid our feelings, in these respects, than our convictions, when they have been made. Now I wish to put you all on your guard, relative to this fundamental law of our nature, because, as I have previously stated, it is one of the two chief pillars, on which the religions of the world rest for support, and if this shall be now destroyed, they must, of necessity, fall. They have, as I most conscientiously believe, no other foundation of any sufficient strength to retain them in existence. They rest but upon these two pillars, and we shall soon try the strength of the other, which will next come under our view. Let us here pause, my friends, for a moment, to consider the depth of that darkness, in which our ancestors must have been involved, not to have discovered through so many ages, this, almost self-evident truth.

MR. CAMPBELL'S FOURTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—The questions which were yesterday proposed to Mr. Owen, very naturally presented themselves from his own premises. He proposed to prove all religions human, therefore he must show that human beings could invent them. This, I contend, he must do, or give up his first position. But he supposes that I will not insist upon his attending to them. In this he is doubtless mistaken, I do insist upon it, and I think he will feel himself compelled to attend to them. But he has promised to take them under his consideration by-and-by. I will just remark here, that his last address is but a repetition of the preceding one. Both amount to this, that man did not make himself, and consequently is irresponsible: *ergo*, all religions must be false. This appears to be his darling corollary. As to my admission of the twelve "facts," which I did for the sake of argument, I say again, I am ready to admit them all, with the exception already stated. But what of this? Mr. Owen may state twelve *facts*, as he calls them, more about man, and I may admit them all, and yet the original question be just as it was. If Mr. Owen had said, that a man has two eyes, two ears, two hands, two feet, etc. etc., and such and such mental faculties; I would admit it. But when admitted, will it follow from these truths, accidents or properties, affirmed of man, that all religions are false? I admitted, at first hearing, most of his facts, because, my great object is to admit everything in any degree relevant or pertinent to the argument, that we may save time, and put the controversy upon the proper issue. But my friend has said that the whole pith of the argument is concentrated in the corollary, that man did not make himself, *ergo*, is irresponsible. Now this dogma puts out of the

world, and out of human language, every idea of responsibility of any kind, or to any being whatever. Is this the consummation devoutly to be wished by all necessarians! According to this argument, no responsibility of any sort can be predicated of man any more than of a stone, this is the legitimate stopping-place of the emancipating principle, of the system of unconquerable circumstances. What mighty results! No blame, no praise, no virtue, no vice, no thanks, no gratitude! All our social, moral, natural, and religious relations, obligations, and dependencies are at once annihilated by the besom of this sweeping corollary.

Mr. Owen has dwelt with much pleasure upon the loveliness of those kind feelings which his system is to generate. How short-sighted the philosopher! Will not this principle of necessity inevitably exterminate all good, kind, and generous feelings! Does he lay any basis for benevolent feelings! He inveighs against the bad feelings of society. His system condemns him here. He might as rationally inveigh against benevolent, as malevolent feelings. And I repeat, what basis does he lay for the former, rather than the latter! Do not these principles assume man to be as much a particle of matter as my friend's coat, which he says cannot help being black. Who would think of praising a coat because it is white, or of blaming a coat because it is black? As little commendable is virtue—as little condemnable is vice!!

Mr. Owen views man as just so many pounds of matter subject to all the laws of matter, and in this view his laws of human nature are no more than the laws of a stone. And it is plain that no man, *compos mentis*, can attribute praise or blame, merit or demerit, virtue or vice to a stone. It is quite natural for me to like good water, but can I feel grateful to the fountain or rivulet which slakes my thirst? Can I thank the earth which sustains me with its harvests, or the tree which refreshes me with its fruit and its shade? No, because there is nothing voluntary, nothing moral, in these contributions of nature.—This beneficence of the fountain, the earth, and the tree is purely necessary or involuntary. I know that they cannot refuse to render me their tributes. I know that it is a necessary and inseparable incident to the law of their nature that they should be tributary to man. I repeat it, that Mr. Owen's doctrine of irresponsibility lays the ax to the root of that tree from whence spring all our feelings, good as well as evil. Like a rash and unskillful physician, he kills the patient while he kills the fever. All the kind feelings, complacency, affection, and social delights are murdered by the same sword which is unsheathed to stab religion to the heart.

If I could be brought to admit that man is altogether a material being, a pure animal, I could have little difficulty in admitting the whole of Mr. Owen's theory. I could then be brought to believe that all our ideas of our natural, moral, social and religious relations, obligations and dependencies were absurd. I earnestly wish that my friend was more fully aware, than he seems to be, that

while he is thus aiming at the extermination of all bad feelings, he is in reality sapping the foundations of society.

But Mr. Owen tells us that the infant man could not help being surrounded with his individual set of circumstances. Well, admit it; but is man ever to remain an infant? If he were always to remain in a state of infantile imbecility, then he might be likened to the tree or to the stone located to the soil, subject only to the laws of mere organic matter. But how few of the human family are controlled by the peculiar circumstances which surrounded their infancy? That they are in some measure affected by them, is admitted; but ninety-nine in every hundred rise superior, or fall inferior, to their circumstances. I apprehend it to be a capital fallacy in Mr. Owen's theory, that while he originates man in a certain set of circumstances, he leaves him there, and never considers that the adult man is continually *changing* his circumstances, and that there is not a more common incident in human life, nor a more common phrase in human language, than to *change one's circumstances*. We change our circumstances, and our circumstances change us. And while, in one sense, man is as dependent for his future development as for his organization on circumstances, it is just as true that he controls his circumstances with as much ease as Mr. Owen changes his coat, his climate, his food, or his country.

We say that infants, idiots, lunatics, and the *non compos mentes*, are irresponsible, and we have guardians assigned them. All societies agree that these are irresponsible, because they are either untaught, or unteachable. But carry out Mr. Owen's principles to their legitimate length, and the conclusion irresistibly follows that all men are reduced to the state of *non compos mentis*—the sage is as irresponsible as the idiot. Irrational animals and vegetables are to be loved or hated, praised or dispraised—are as sociable, as responsible and as irresponsible as philosophers. There can be no responsibility exacted from any human being on these principles, more than from a stone, a tree, a horse, or a dog.

What is involved and presupposed in the idea of responsibility? Certainly rationality. We never think of praising or blaming, of rewarding or punishing an infant until its rational faculties are in some degree developed. When he has been trained to acquire a rational discrimination between right and wrong, then we begin to connect the idea of responsibility with that infant. Common sense, then, teaches us that rationality and responsibility are terms nearly allied, and that the development of the one is inseparably connected with the development of the other. All but philosophists agree that reason can control that which is irrational; that reason is stronger than the laws of attraction or cohesion, and, therefore, all men who have not philosophized themselves beyond the regions of common sense, are agreed that every being whose reason is developed, is responsible for his actions, and that where reason does not exist, or is not developed, praise or blame, or responsibility cannot be attributed. Now

Mr. Owen makes all men everlasting infants, or predicates his whole philosophy of the assumption that the infant, the idiot, and the philosopher, are equally irresponsible, and equally controlled by circumstances, both of which are as far removed from the regions of common sense and all human experience, as the reveries of Baron Swedenborg. This far, right, reason, and common sense go with us. But when we transcend these limits, both reason and common sense bid us adieu. It is obvious that man, in the first instance, comes upon the stage under a great variety of circumstances, but it does not follow that he is riveted to those circumstances, or that he may not exalt or degrade himself by rising superior or falling inferior to these circumstances.

But not only are sages and idiots reduced to the same level of irresponsibility by Mr. Owen's system, but it reaches still further. It saps the foundations, not only of all human responsibility, of all morality, but also, of all obligation to any being in the universe. In the first instance, it involves us in impenetrable darkness with respect to our origin. Mr. Owen's system gives us no idea of any origin of our being, or of any relation in which, as creatures, we stand to our Creator. The system not only goes to revolutionize the moral, civil, and municipal policy of all the civilized world, but it proscribes all dependence upon any unknown, unseen cause whatever. This led me, yesterday, to show that Mr. Owen could not demonstrate his first proposition, without accounting for the relation in which we stand to a superior being, or discarding it altogether. This led me to call on him for an analysis of our mental powers. This, too, induced me to present those five questions to him at our adjournment yesterday evening. This is just the point on which so much depends, and to which we anxiously solicit the attention of my opponent and this audience. But Mr. Owen declines this investigation for the time being, but promises it hereafter.

In the meantime, then, as I conceive, I have glanced at the items in his last address, which have any direct bearings on the proposition before us, I will occupy my time yet remaining with some strictures on the different systems of skepticism. And I think it will be seen, from the brief notices which we are about to take of them, that, so soon as we abandon the bible, there is not a speck of *terra firma* accessible to human ingenuity, on which anything worthy of the name of *system* can be built. No system of *nature*, nor of *human nature* can be presented from the annals of the world, nor from the improvements of modern science, which is not confessedly conjectural, doubtful, and unworthy of any sort of confidence; which is not based purely upon *imagination;* and which only allures from the haven of safety, to the wide and tempestuous ocean of absolute uncertainty, without even promising us compass, helm, or pilot to conduct us to a safe anchorage again. I have rummaged antiquity, and the systems of philosophy, ancient and modern. I have explored these systems, and find them all rich in promise, but bankrupt in accomplish-

ment. They begin with a *perhaps*, proceed with a *may be*, and end with a *perchance*.* But let us take a peep into these treasures.

Skepticism embraces as great a variety of sects as any other of the *isms* of ancient or modern times. The skeptics generally range themselves under one or other of the following general denominations: Deists, Theists, Atheists, Pantheists. The subdivisions are too numerous to mention in this place. It comes with a very ill grace from skeptics to object to christianity, because of the various sects into which the christian community is torn, seeing they cannot exhibit anything like a visible unity among themselves, except in opposing christianity. I presume there are not to be found upon earth so many writers on any one subject, differing so much from one another, as

---

* "The philosophers admitted their own ignorance, and the necessity there was for further instruction. Socrates, meeting Alcibiades going to the temple to pray, dissuaded him from it, because he knew not how to do it till one should come to teach him. 'It is altogether necessary,' says he, 'that you should wait for some person to teach you how you ought to behave yourself, both to the gods and men.' Plato tells the Athenians, that they would remain in a state of sleep forever, if God did not, out of pity, send them an instructor. Cicero says: "I do not suppose that Arcesilaus engaged in dispute with Zeno out of obstinacy, or a desire of superiority, but to show that obscurity, under which all things lie, and which forced Socrates to a confession of his ignorance. And all those who were in a manner enamored with Socrates; such also as Democritus, Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and almost all the ancients were reduced to the same confession. They all maintained that no true insight could be acquired; nothing clearly perceived or known, that our senses were limited, our intellect weak, and the course of man's life short." According to Democritus, truth lay buried in the depths of the sea, or in a well without a bottom. Such was the utter uncertainty into which these philosophers had reasoned themselves respecting the nature of God, the immortality of the soul, and a future state, the most important of all subjects, of which barbarians, keeping closer to early tradition, were not so grossly ignorant. Here we may adopt the words of Gibbon, which we should scarcely have expected from such a quarter.

"Since, therefore, the most sublime efforts of philosophy can extend no farther than feebly to point out the desire, the hope, or, at most, the probability, of a future state, *there is nothing, except a divine revelation*, that can ascertain the existence, and describe the condition, of the invisible country which is destined to receive the souls of men after the separation from the body. But we may perceive several defects inherent to the popular religions of Greece and Rome, which rendered them very unequal to so arduous a task. 1. The general system of mythology was unsupported by any solid proofs; and the wisest among the Pagans had already disclaimed its usurped authority. 2. The description of the infernal regions had been abandoned to the fancy of painters and of poets, who peopled them with many phantoms and monsters, who dispensed their rewards and punishments with so little equity, that a solemn truth, the most congenial to the human heart, was oppressed and disgraced by the absurd mixture of the wildest fictions. 3. The doctrine of a future state was scarcely considered among the devout Polytheists of Greece and Rome, as a fundamental article of faith. The providence of the gods, as it related to public communities rather than to private individuals, was principally displayed on the visible theater of the present world. The petitions which were offered on the altars of Jupiter or Apollo, expressed the anxiety of their worshipers for temporal happiness, and their ignorance or indifference concerning a future life. The important truth of the immortality of the soul was inculcated with more diligence, as well as success, in India, in Assyria, in Egypt, and in Gaul."—*Hald's Ev. v.* 1, p. 23.

the skeptical writers. I do not know that there can be found two works extant, under any respectable name, on any one system of skepticism, which do not differ from each other as much, at least, as the Calvinists differ from the Arminians. While they boast so much (especially such of them as believe with Mr. Paine) of the easy intelligibility of the volume of nature, which he sometimes calls the "*Word of God*" (that speaks the same thing in all languages), one would expect to find a remarkable conformity and coincidence of sentiment among the students of this one volume, which needs neither translation nor commentary. Yet none are more unsociable in their sentiments, nor more diverse in their conclusions, than they. The Persian, the Indian, the Hindoo, and the Philosopher, all read and understand this volume of nature very differently. There are more versions of the volume of nature, than of the volume of revelation. Though, they say, it wants no *written* commentary, it certainly requires some prophet or interpreter to explain it. How else came it to pass that all the ancient nations, and all the modern, without revelation, have, from the same premises, come to so many different conclusions! Rome had one hundred and seventeen opinions about the *summum bonum* in its Augustan age; the Grecian states had almost as many gods as soldiers; and a wit once said: "*It is more easy to find a god than a man in Athens!*" But not only did the multiplication of gods and goddesses exhibit the fooleries of the readers of the volume of nature, but the infamous characters they gave their gods and the crimes they laid to their charge. Their Gods were monsters of cruelty, lewdness, and profligacy. The morality learned from this volume was as various and as imperfect as its theology. Human sacrifices were offered upon their altars; their temples were places of prostitution; fornication and drunkenness formed the religious worship of Venus and Bacchus. Plutarch, in some particular instances, recommended as a virtue, that which, in many places, was a common usage, viz: to expose infants to death by cold and hunger, or to be devoured by wild beasts. The Grecian sages gave parents permission to kill their children—and suicide was recommended as a virtue. So teaches the volume of nature!

But I only intend here to notice the divisions among skeptics as respects the systems extant.

Some Italian and French skeptics, shortly after the Reformation, or about the time of the Reformation, assumed the honorable designation of *Deists*. These agreed in *three things*, viz: 1. To profess no system of religion, and to oppose christianity. 2. To contend for the existence of one God. And 3. To follow what they called "*the light of nature.*" But about this "one God" and this "light of nature," they were anything but agreed. Deistical writers subdivide themselves into mortal and immortal Deists; the former denying, and the latter affirming a future state. Dr. Clarke enumerated four grand classes of Deists or of deistical writers, all agreeing in acknow-

ledging one Supreme God, but differing in almost everything else. Lord Herbert stands at the head of the list of the English fraternity, and seems to have aimed in his book, "*De Veritate,*" at giving some sort of a system to skepticism. His five points are the following:

1. That there is one supreme God.
2. That he is chiefly to be worshiped.
3. That piety and virtue are the principal parts of his worship.
4. That we must repent of our sins; and if we do so, God will pardon them.
5. That there are rewards for good men, and punishments for bad men, both here and hereafter.

This English Baron wished to form a universal religion for all mankind, predicated of what he calls "reason and the light of nature." He was emboldened to publish it in the seventeenth century by a miracle, as he represents it!

Concerning the Theists we shall only observe that they are censured more than the Deists by Monsieur Mirabaud for approximating more to the superstition of Christians than the pure Deists. They *humanize* their God too much; give him too much the character of a governor, and too many of the attributes which are supposed essential to a good governor; whereas the pure Deists make their God rather an indifferent spectator, an uninterested observer of the affairs of this life. Among these natural religionists, or Theists, there is a great variety. They are as discordant as the Speculative Deist. The celebrated Atheist *Mirabaud* thus castigates them, vol. 2, p. 208.

"The *Theists*, one after another, to explain the conduct of his God, finds himself in continual embarrassment, from which he will not know how to withdraw himself, but in admitting all the theological reveries, without excepting even those absurd fables, which were imagined to render an account of the strange economy of this being, so good, so wise, so full of equity; it will be needful from supposition to supposition, to recur to the sin of *Adam*, or to the *fall of the rebel angels*, or to the crime of Prometheus and the box of Pandora to find in what manner evil has crept into the world, subjected to a benevolent intelligence. It will be necessary to suppose the free agency of man; it will be necessary to acknowledge that the creature can offend his God, provoke his anger, move his passions, and calm them afterward by superstitious ceremonies and expiations." All these and many more faults does he find to the Theists.

Thomas Paine, in his Age of Reason, page 3, gives his creed in one period—"I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life." In another period he gives his creed in morality—"I believe the equality of man, and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow-creatures happy." In speaking of the perfection of the *book of creation* as *a word of God*, or as a revelation, he thus eulogizes it—"Do we want to contemplate his power? We see it in the immensity of creation. Do we want to contemplate his

wisdom? We see it in the unchangeable order, by which the incomprehensible whole is governed. Do we want to contemplate his munificence? We see it in the abundance with which he fills the earth. Do we want to contemplate his mercy? We see it in his not withholding that abundance even from the unthankful. In short, do we want to know what God is? Search not the scripture other than that called the creation."

Mr. Paine did not want to see his justice; and therefore, he failed in telling us what to contemplate in order to discover this. Deists have not so much curiosity on this point. The skeptics of the *atheistical* school are not more unanimous than they of the Deistical. It is amusing, if not instructive, to hear or see how these skeptics of the two schools handle one another. Let us take a sample from two of the most notable—viz: Mr. Paine the *Deist*, and M. Mirabaud the *atheist*. The atheist says—vol. 2, 211: "Is there in any one religion in the world, a *miracle*, more impossible to be believed, than that of the *creation*, or of the eduction from nothing? Is there a *mystery* more difficult to be comprehended than a God impossible to be conceived; and whom, however, it is necessary to admit!" "Between the Deist and the superstitious (christians) it is impossible to fix the line of demarcation, which separates them from the most credulous men; or from those who reason the least upon the article of religion. Indeed, it is difficult to decide with precision the true dose of folly which may be permitted them." After this denunciation let us hear Mr. Paine, page 57: "The only idea man can affix to the name of God, is that of a *first cause*, the cause of all things. And incomprehensively difficult as it is for man to conceive what a first cause is, he arrives at the belief of it, from the tenfold greater difficulty of disbelieving it. It is difficult beyond description to conceive that space can have no end; but it is more difficult to conceive an end. It is difficult beyond the power of man to conceive an eternal duration of what we call time; but it is more impossible to conceive a time when there shall be no time. In like manner of reasoning everything we behold carries in itself the internal evidence that it did not make itself. Every man is an evidence to himself that he did not make himself; neither could his father, nor his grandfather, nor any of his race; neither could any tree, plant, or animal make itself: and it is the conviction, arising from this evidence, that carries us on, as it were, by necessity, to the belief of a *First Cause* eternally existing, of a nature totally different from any material existence we know of, and by the power of which all things exist; and this first cause man calls God." Then he sings Addison's versification of the 19th psalm. These distinguished skeptics are as opposite here, though not so palpably so, as when the former says: "*All theology is false;*" and the latter affirms *there is one true theology*—and one unadulterated revelation of God—viz: the Universe. The Deist even puts these words into the mouth of his deity. "I have made an earth for man to dwell upon, and I have rendered the

starry heavens visible, to teach him science and the arts. He can now provide for his own comfort, and learn from my munificence to all, to be kind to each other," page 35. But more contradictory yet—Mirabaud asks: "Can there be a mystery more difficult to be comprehended than a God?" and Paine asserts, page 54: "The belief of a God, so far from having anything of a mystery in it, is of all beliefs the most easy: because it arises to us out of necessity." But the French sage, though he so frequently asserts the belief of a God to be the climax of absurdity, is contradicted flatly and boldly by his brother skeptics of the great assembly at Bordeaux, who in their twenty-five precepts of reason, placed the following at the head of the list:—

"*All nature announces to thee a Creator: adore him. He is everywhere: Everywhere he will hear thee.*"

But going no farther into the detail—let us just notice the varieties existing among *Atheists*. Among the ancients Dr. Cudworth reckons four distinct sects of Atheists: 1. The Disciples of Anaximander, called Hylopathians, who attributed the formation of everything to matter destitute of feeling. 2. Atomists, or the Disciples of Democritus, who attributed everything to the concurrence of atoms. 3. The stoical atheists, who admitted a blind nature, but acting after certain laws. 4. The Hylozoists or the Disciples of Strato—who attributed life to matter. Dr. Cudworth's *systema Intellectuale*, chap. 2, mir. vol. 2, p. 300.

Other diversities have occasioned various sects among atheists. They have differed as much upon morality, virtue, and vice, as about the origin of all things. Aristippus, Theodorus the atheist, Bion, and Pyrrho, denied any distinction between virtue and vice. In modern times, the author of the fable of the Bees, and the Man Automaton have reasoned away all difference between virtue and vice. Mirabaud, vol. 2, p. 319.

Indeed, Mirabaud, though one of the oldest advocates of atheism, declares, vol. 2, page 318, "THAT ATHEISM WILL NOT MAKE A WICKED MAN GOOD."

Bayle, when speaking of the Epicureans, says: "Those who embraced the sect of '*Epicurus the atheist*' did not become debauchees, because they had embraced the doctrine of Epicurus; they only embraced the doctrine of Epicurus, then badly understood, *because they were debauchees!*" High encomiums on atheism!!

Among the moderns we have had several sects of atheists, or atheistical writers, such as Spinoza, Hobbes, Vannini.

Spinosism, so called from Spinoza, the Jew, born in Amsterdam, 1632, teaches but *one substance* in nature—all the bodies of the universe are various modifications of this one substance—all the souls of men are modifications of this one substance—that there is but *one being* and *one nature;* and that this nature by an imminent act produces all those which we call creatures. Thus his Deity is both agent and patient, creator and creature. No two atheists now living,

or who have published anything to the world, agree in their speculations. Indeed, how can they? There is no fixed principle. The materialists of Mr. Owen's scheme differ, in some respect, from the materialists of the French school. But, indeed, they differ from themselves. They are not the same theorists in June and January. A change in the thermometer often produces a change in the whole system. An attack of bilious fever, a single emetic, or a cathartic, has been known essentially to change a whole system.

Pantheism is of early, but unknown origin. Some of the Pantheists held the universe to be one immense animal, of which the incorporeal soul was properly the god, and the heavens and the earth the body of that god. Orpheus, one of the most ancient Pantheists of whom we read, called the world the body of God, and its several parts his members, making the whole universe one divine animal. Aristotle was pretty much of the same opinion: he held that God and matter were co-eternal, and that there is some such union among them as exists between the soul and body.

Polytheists have deified dead men, animals, and even vegetables, and have ascribed to them honors and attributes which belong to the Creator alone. But there is no boundary to be set to the vagaries of the human mind. At one time, and in some circumstances, it sees a god in everything; at another time, and in other circumstances, it sees a god in nothing. So true is yet found the saying of the unpopular Paul of Tarsus, "Professing themselves to be philosophers, they became *fools*."

My friend and opponent has contributed his mite to the mass of bewilderment which has been read. He has given us a new system of skepticism perfectly intangible. "Twelve facts" have been asserted concerning the *materiality* of man. And these facts have been presented to us in such a shape as to strike at the root of all our ideas concerning our spiritual relations.

We are unable to conceive of the immense revolution which must be produced in the mind of one who has been put in possession of all the biblical ideas and terms, by the annihilation of all ideas of God, and the relations to which they give birth. The idea of the existence of a God and his perfections once annihilated, and what have you left? On the principles of philosophy it is just as hard to destroy as to create a single idea. In philosophy, these two ideas concerning the power of creating and the power of destroying are intimately connected and inseparably interwoven. If I could forget that I ever had heard the name of God, and could erase from the tablet of my mind all my ideas of *spiritual things*, I am at a loss to conceive what views I could entertain of any object around me. Everything would be to me a most inexplicable puzzle. But the question which must forever confound the materialists of all schools is, *How did these ideas get into the world?* There must be some way of disposing of them. It devolves on my friend and opponent to explain the origin of those ideas, which have universally obtained among

mankind, *on spiritual subjects.* It is incumbent on him to avow explicitly whether he conceives us to be indebted to a supreme or superior being for anything we possess. Man does not owe his existence to any human being; from whence, then, does he derive it? The *unde derivatur* of man, or the *whence came he,* must be determined before he can ascertain the nature of any of his relations.

The basis of all obligation or responsibility I hold to be *dependence.* A being, independent of any other, has no rule to obey but that which his own reason or will prescribes. But a state of dependence will inevitably oblige the inferior to take the will of him on whom he depends as the rule of his conduct, at least, in all those points wherein his dependence consists; consequently, as man depends absolutely upon his Creator for everything, it is necessary that he should, in all points, submit to his will. This I do hold to be the true and immovable basis of natural, social and religious obligation and responsibility. Now, if Mr. Owen can prove that we are all *independent* beings, and show wherein we are all independent, he carries out his system to a triumphant issue at once. Only let him prove that we are not dependent beings, and then the conclusion must follow out that we owe nothing to our Creator, to our parents, our benefactors, or any other creditors. I say, in holding the affirmative that we are irresponsible, he must prove that we are independent. But this will be to wage war with common sense, with universal experience. I will not consume time in proving a point which is itself as plain as the proof could be, viz: that mankind are dependent, and therefore responsible.

Mr. Owen supposes the capital error of all religions to be that they teach that belief is under the control of the will—whereas he supposes the contrary. But it would seem that he attaches no very definite meaning to the word *belief,* when he asked you to be so good as to believe for only five minutes that he did not stand in *propria persona* before you, or that Mahomet was a prophet sent from God.

Mr. Owen certainly errs in his views of faith, or supposes you have an uncontrolled power over your belief, when he asked you to believe, without *evidence,* that Mahomet was a true prophet. If I, or any christian, had affirmed that a person could believe without *evidence,* then he might have made such a demand upon you; otherwise he could not rationally have made such an appeal. We contend that *testimony* is essential to faith; and that whether we shall possess the testimony sufficient to constrain belief, very generally depends upon our determination or volition.

But I would ask what idea he attaches to the word *belief.* I am apprehensive that he confounds, or uses interchangeably, the terms *belief, knowledge* and *opinion. Belief* always depends upon the testimony of others; *knowledge,* upon the evidence of our senses; *opinion,* upon our own reasonings. I do not, in strict propriety of lan-

guage, believe by my eyes, any more than I hear by my fingers. I *know* this desk is before me, I do not *believe* it. We *know* that Mr. Owen is here, but we cannot *believe* it. Therefore, for Mr. Owen to ask the audience to believe that he is not now before them, is entirely unwarrantable. I *know* that which is communicated to my sensorium through the avenues of my senses; and all that is thus communicated, we denominate *knowledge*. On the other hand, *belief* has exclusive reference to testimony; and *opinion* merely expresses different degrees of *probability;* and after weighing these probabilities, we say that we are of this, that, or the other opinion. I may be of opinion that there is a navigable passage around the north pole—that all infants who die go to heaven, etc. Opinions result from premises not certain, or are the conclusions to which we are led from all the data before us. But wherever we believe, it must be upon sufficient testimony. In a word, I *know* this desk is before me; I *believe* that Thomas Jefferson is dead; and I am of *opinion* that Symmes' theory is all a mere fancy. I think Mr. Owen will accede to this.

I must just remark, in passing, that it is not difficult to prove the contrary of Mr. Owen's sixth position. That our volitions do, in many instances, determine our belief, or have some influence upon it, I doubt not can be made apparent to all. Suppose, for example, that I am told that some important event has transpired, which, in a peculiar point of view, is very important to me—my informant, we will farther suppose, is a man of suspected veracity. Now, I cannot believe nor disbelieve on the evidence offered. But in consequence of the interest I feel, I determine to examine the evidence, and finally I collect such a body of evidence, as convinces me of the truth of the first report. But, if I had not willed or determined on eviscerating or searching out the truth of my first informant's narrative, could I have arrived at a full belief of the report? Now, the question is, was not my belief of this fact, some way dependent on my volition?

MR. OWEN'S FIFTH ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman—I perfectly agree with my friend in his discriminations between knowledge, belief, and opinion; but all I have to say is, that in the case to which he has referred, it was his interest that generated his will, and therefore it was his interest that compelled him to investigate. I am also much indebted to my friend, Mr. Campbell, for his learned dissertation upon the opinions of others, for I did not trouble myself very much about a knowledge, in detail, of these opinions before. My researches were not in that direction, after I ascertained they contained so little really useful practical information. The object I had in view compelled me to become a practical man, "to study from the life, and in the original peruse mankind." I have totally avoided metaphysical reading, because I discovered it was not calculated to relieve society from its errors and difficulties; it has too many words and too few facts.

Much have I read formerly of this character, that was unsatisfactory, and much have I seen and observed since. In consequence, metaphysical disquisitions which have interested me in my youth have long since given place to the investigation of facts, and legitimate deductions from them that I might acquire a knowledge of their best application to practice. Many of these metaphysical disquisitions have already continued for thousands of years, and may continue to proceed for millions more, without producing any practical benefit, or bringing us nearer to our object. It is now full time that we direct our attention to facts, and to a just practice founded on those facts. It does appear to me, from all the facts I know, that not only our belief but our knowledge and opinions are determined for us by the strongest impressions which external circumstances make upon our individual organizations. That no man has, of his own will, by the exercise of his own volition, formed his own knowledge, belief, or opinion. I have never heard a single argument or seen any fact to prove that man ever forms his opinions by the decision of his will, contrary to the convictions made upon his mind by the impressions which he has received from external circumstances, or subsequent intimate reflection, the individual not knowing what would be the result of those reflections until they were completed.

My friends, the next great law of human nature which goes to prove the gross ignorance in which human nature has been kept, and the injurious effects of all religions, is the seventh in my arrangement. It is—"That each individual must like that which creates agreeable, and dislike that which produces unpleasant sensations upon his nature, while at the same time he cannot discover, previously to experience, what these sensations shall be." When our minds shall have been relieved from the prejudices of a vicious education, when we shall be permitted, without prejudice, to examine facts as they really are, and to infer the rational deductions from those facts, we shall discover, that all the governments of the world, all the religions, all the codes of laws, and all the social and other institutions of mankind have been founded in the false notion, that human nature was so organized, that it had the power by its own mere volitions, to believe conformably to its inclinations, and to love or hate according to its will. Now I contend that no human being has the power of his own will to like, be indifferent to, or dislike any person, or anything contrary to the sensations which they produce upon him. Who, in this assembly, when any new food is brought before him can determine before tasting it, whether it is insipid, grateful, or distasteful to his palate? Will not his determination upon this point depend entirely upon the sensations produced by this food upon his palate after tasting it? If a stranger were announced as being about to come into this assembly, where is the individual among you, who is prepared to determine, before he has seen this stranger, whether he shall like, be indifferent to, or dislike him. Would not one and all of you be compelled to receive the impressions

which the countenance, the figure, the manner, and the address of this stranger, would enforce upon your individual organizations?

Now, those who think they are doing good service to the world by attempting to disprove the doctrine which I advocate, should consider well these two fundamental laws of our nature. I rest a very large portion of my argument to prove the errors of all religions, and of the truth of the principles which I advocate, on a thorough conviction from the evidence of innumerable facts, that human nature is so organized by the laws of its creator, as to be passive in the reception of its sensations, except so far as it may be influenced by previous sensations of liking, or disliking. You have been taught some fanciful notions of what you have heard termed God, Deity, or *First Cause;* and you have been taught other fanciful notions of a being who has been introduced to you by the name of *the Devil*, who was created by an infinitely wise and good power. Then, my friends, if you have a control over your likings and dislikings, just for the sake of the experiment, endeavor to hate the first, and to love the second. Can any one of you so far control his will as to do this? In common candor, my friends, you must be compelled to acknowledge that you cannot. But you will be pleased to observe, that I, by no means, admit by anything I may have said, that any intelligence infinitely wise, good, and powerful, ever did make (knowing what it was about) a devil, to torment us. No, indeed, I cannot believe any absurdity so monstrous as this. But to return to our subject. We are, fortunately for us, compelled to like that which produces pleasant sensations, and to dislike that which produces their opposites. Then if there be wisdom in the command, that we should love one another, there is but one practical course whereby to obey it. It is to act consistently with the principle I have now developed, which will lead you to train your children to acquire such qualities as are universally lovely, and then they must be beloved for possessing those qualities. Our nature is such, that when they are so formed, we cannot help loving them; and until they are so formed, it is not in human nature to love them. But we shall soon become acquainted with the method whereby to train our infants, step by step, in such a manner that they shall command our love. And when this shall be the case, the command to do so will become useless. What utility is there in commanding me to love that which possesses qualities which are disagreeable to me? And what necessity is there for such a command, when we know that we have the power to create the best dispositions, manners, and habits in the whole human race, and thus give such qualities as will always insure love or affection from every one? How often have uninstructed, unenlightened men told you that these principles lead to vice? But if ever virtue shall be known and practiced among mankind, it will only be through the knowledge of these principles, and through the universality of the practice which they demonstrate to be the best for man to adopt.

There never was, in the imagination of any human being, a collection of facts so truly valuable to the whole of mankind as those which are contained in these twelve laws; each one of them is of invaluable truth. But when united and formed into a system for reforming the character of men and governing them, what a glorious change will be effected for the well-being and happiness of the human race? When this shall be accomplished, as I anticipate will be the case in a few years, how very different will our residence in this world become? How different from any state or condition ever yet witnessed in any former period, or in the present times? There will be then no strife nor contention. Then all will say, "if any of my fellow-beings do not love or respect me, I know the cause is in myself; and therefore, I will, thus informed, endeavor to remove the disagreeable parts of my character, and set about the correction of all my faults and failings, if the superior knowledge of those who educate me have left any of them to be now corrected; but I could not be displeased with my fellow-being for expressing a sensation which I had caused him to feel; this will necessarily remove an error too palpable to be entertained." That we should have acted so long upon any other principle, is a proof of the ignorance and darkness in which the errors of religion have surrounded us. But unfortunately, my friends, a steady attention in the investigation of facts, will now enable us to discover the road which leads unerringly to certain happiness; and the means by which to secure it permanently, without the horrible notion, that some of our fellow-beings must suffer eternal torments.

My friends, I do not know what your ideas of deity may be, but having attended to the realities of human life and human nature, I am compelled to believe that if I knew that one sentient being existed in eternal torment, that knowledge alone would prevent me from being perfectly happy. How, therefore, an all-wise, all-good, and perfect being, should make human beings thus to suffer, knowing what he was doing when he made them, is too inconsistent to make any conviction of its truth in my mind. To me it appears an extraordinary and unaccountable notion of error—one really too absurd to be longer taught to man, or child.

We now come to the 8th fundamental law of human nature, viz: "that each person is so created, that the impressions made on his organization, although pleasant at first, yet, if continued beyond a certain period, without change, will become disagreeable; and when this change is too rapid it impairs our physical, intellectual, and moral powers and enjoyments."

It is of no use for the human mind to waste its powers and faculties in imagining what human nature *ought* to be according to the whims and fancies of some men. True knowledge will direct us at once to inquire what *it is*. Of no use is it to imagine that it ought to be, according to our ignorant notions, something else than what it is. We have nothing to do but to inquire what human nature is,

what are its organic laws, and how it is formed from infancy to maturity?

We shall discover it to be a universal law that human nature requires for its happiness, health, well-being, and a change of sensations. If any one sensation were to be continued without change, it would, after a certain time, become as painful as at first it was agreeable. We are, therefore, beings so organized as to require a certain change of our sensations. But when we proceed beyond a certain number in a given period, these sensations will gradually become disagreeable, and ultimately produce misery instead of happiness. This is another admirable law of our organization. It teaches us in the most emphatic manner, that to preserve health, spirits and happiness, we must proceed in all our exercises, in all our enjoyments, to the point of temperance, and not beyond it; or, in other words, that the highest enjoyment of human life is to be attained by a due exercise of all our propensities and capacities at the point of temperance. I will endeavor to develop to you some of the miseries arising from the infraction of this law. Men and women, by the laws of many countries, are made solemnly to promise that they will love each other to the termination of their lives; and yet neither the one nor the other can know that it will be in their power to perform the promise for one day. They commit this error by not attending to this and other unchanging laws of our nature. Where is now the man or woman who has committed this moral perjury, who knew certainly, at the time of making the vow, whether they would be able to love each other for an hour? And how much misery has this error produced? How much happiness has it destroyed? Your ignorance on the subject of belief, and of liking and disliking, have produced almost all the evils of domestic life, as well as almost all the dissensions between nations. Ignorance of this law of our nature has divided and subdivided the world into various classes greatly to the injury of all. One class, which may be called producers, have their physical powers called into action far beyond the point of temperance. Another class, which may be called non-producers, have their memory and imagination overstrained far beyond the natural limits. The former class are subject to innumerable evils in consequence of their physical powers being over-exerted and their mental powers being unexercised. The latter class has been, perhaps, still more unfortunate in having their physical powers neglected and their memory and imagination too much exercised. And the world is generally divided into these two classes and their subdivisions. When we shall come to the knowledge of what manner of beings we are, these errors must cease; society will be differently arranged, and there will be but one class trained and educated, and placed under new circumstances that will enable all to enjoy the full extent of their respective capacities at the point of experience; and that class will have their physical, intellectual, and moral faculties equally cultivated, and duly and temperately

exercised. We shall, by acquiring an accurate knowledge of these laws of our nature, begin to discover what real knowledge is, and what is necessary to constitute our true and substantial happiness. At present we do not know what plan, system, or practice is necessary to constitute our happiness, and therefore we do not know what to adopt to promote it.

Before our meeting in this place shall terminate, I will endeavor to explain what are those things which are necessary for our happiness—that all may know what it is that we should endeavor to attain.

MR. CAMPBELL'S FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—It seems a very hard matter, indeed, to reason logically when we have nothing to reason against. We require not only to have premises established *from* which to reason, but we must have a definite object *for* which to reason. There is scarcely anything tangible or pertinent in Mr. Owen's last address, any more than in his preceding ones. He has not put himself to the trouble to investigate or to discriminate with regard to the difficulties involved in our argumentation, if such it may be called. My friend might naturally have anticipated to have been met, in the course of this discussion, with "How did man come into existence?" Are we going to extinguish all the lights we have upon this momentous question without presenting a single spark in lieu thereof? If man did not make himself, then, I ask, how came he into existence? Again, we have presented some (as we conceive) insuperable difficulties in the way of Mr. Owen's views of irresponsibility. We have urged upon him this difficulty. We have proved that his theory reduces the idiot and the sage to the same level of irresponsibility. And we did expect (reasonably we think) that he would have adverted to, and at least attempted to remove this stumbling block. But Mr. Owen, it seems, has found it convenient to pretermit all notice of this part of our remarks. He has favored us, gratuitously too, with some very good remarks upon temperance. Assuredly Mr. Owen knows that there is no controversy about temperance between us; that I have no objection to men's enjoying the blessings of temperance, and of a sound and healthy action of mind and body. But what has this to do with the argument before us?

I presented another difficulty in the way of my unreserved admission of the proposition that "our will has, *in no case*, any power over our belief." I have contended that our will has power over our assent to the verity of a matter submitted to our understandings as a matter of belief. To this he has paid no regard, in his last speech. Volition cannot create the evidence on which belief must be founded, but it can give stimulus and impulse sufficient to put us upon the investigation of the character of that evidence. Suppose, as Mr. Owen states, that it was my interest that did excite me to investigate the testimony offered, am I not at liberty to act according to what I conceive to be my true interest? And if I so act, do I

not act rationally and voluntarily? Seeing my interest, have I not liberty to make a start in pursuit of it? Consequently our volitions have power in influencing and inducing our belief. In some instances we are compelled to believe.

I might not wish a fact to be true, and yet might be unable to resist the force of the evidence; and, on the other hand, I might wish it to be true, and yet be unable to believe it for want of satisfactory evidence. Thus contradictory to our volitions, such is the sovereignty of evidence to compel belief. This we admit most cheerfully; but from such particular instances to infer a general and universal conclusion, is a sophism of the most palpable detection. I would not sacrifice a single truth that might appear to combat a favorite point for any momentary triumph.

Philosophers run as much into extremes as any other persons. Because Mr. Owen finds instances where belief is involuntary, or, at least, not dependent upon any previous determination, he asserts universally, that, *in no case whatever*, does our belief depend upon our will. But this we shall, in its own place, still farther develop.

Instead of adverting to the difficulties proposed in my last speech, Mr. Owen told us he could never believe that a good and wise being could create a Devil: yet he could believe that the Devil created himself, or that a wise and kind Nature created evil. Natural evils and moral evils do exist from some cause; there are poisons, pains, and death. Yet, with Mr. Owen, there is neither a God nor a Devil! Everything made itself, or all things together made each separate agent!!

Nor can he endure the idea of misery existing anywhere. The thought of any sentient being suffering hereafter, would convert his heaven into a place of torment. He has high conceptions of his future sensibilities! They must be much more perfect than at present: for he can sleep sound and enjoy all animal and social comforts, day and night, without ever thinking or feeling unhappy at the thought—

> "How many feel, this very moment, death
> And all the sad variety of pain.
> How many sink in the devouring flood,
> Or more devouring flame. How many bleed,
> By shameful variance between man and man.
> How many pine in want and dungeon glooms,
> Shut from the common air, and common use
> Of their own limbs. How many drink the cup
> Of baleful grief, or eat the bitter bread
> Of misery. Sore pierced by wintry winds,
> How many shrink into the sordid hut
> Of cheerless poverty. How many shake
> With all the fiercer tortures of the mind,
> Unbounded passion, madness, guilt, remorse;
> Whence tumbled headlong from the height of life,
> They furnish matter for the tragic Muse."

He seems now to enjoy himself, unconscious that there are myriads suffering all the fiercer tortures of mind and body, but yet *fancies*

that the thought of any human being suffering hereafter, would make him most wretchedly unhappy! His sensibilities are very fantastic.

I will now, for the sake of eliciting investigation, submit an outline of what I conceive to be the constituents of the human being. Taking myself for one of the species, and as a sample of the race, I proceed to examine myself with a view to discriminate accurately what manner of being I am; I look at my exterior, my corporeal powers, and senses. Of the latter I perceive that I have five. Through these communications are made to some internal power or principle called *the mind.* The mind through the senses, by what is called sensation, has the power of *perception,* by which I become acquainted with all things external. By *memory* I become acquainted with all things past; by *consciousness* I become acquainted with all things internal. All philosophers agree that we have the powers of perception, memory, and consciousness. Now sensation, perception, memory, and consciousness are just as distinct from each other as the ear, eye, or hand. But these constitute the mind as our different members constitute the body. These faculties are as distinct in their operations as are the different members and organs in the animal part of man. I repeat for the sake of perspicuity and emphasis, that by perception we become acquainted with all things *external.* By memory we take cognizance of all *things past.* By consciousness we become acquainted with things *internal.* Such of these as are active powers act independently of volition. But I ask—Have we any other powers or faculties capable of acting independently of volition? I say *No.* We have, however, the powers of recollecting, reflecting, imagining, reasoning, and judging. These operations of the human mind are dependent upon volition; or, in other words, it depends upon volition, whether I shall or shall not exercise my powers of recollecting, reflecting, imagining, reasoning, or judging. Mr. Owen, it appears to me, confounds our appetites with our highest powers. These I would designate by the term *instincts.* But our appetites, affections, passions, and judgment affect the will, and determine to action. I hope Mr. Owen will either affirm or deny, that we may examine our mental powers, for he seems to overlook them in his system. I beg leave to submit this analysis of our mental powers, in order to ascertain what is the primitive character of the mind. At present we are utterly unable to discover whether Mr. Owen recognizes any distinction between our perception, memory, and consciousness, and our appetites, affections, and passions.

But Mr. Owen has gone so far as to inform us that our ideas of a Deity, Devil, etc., are fanciful. I am glad to hear the assertion, because it may present something tangible. Are we to admit the assertion that the idea of a God is fanciful, or shall we join issue upon this assertion? I have no objections to rest the whole merits of the discussion upon this assertion. This is a tangible position taken by my opponent.

I repeat, that if my opponent can make that assertion good, I will give up the cause I advocate. If he will join issue with me upon this assertion, the scope and compass of this discussion will be much contracted. I conceive that the whole of my opponent's declamation has been entirely irrelevant to the premises before us, and that it has no connection with the real merits of the questions we are to debate. The question whether all religions are founded in ignorance, is a question of fact — of plain, simple, tangible, veritable, demonstrable fact. A man need not to be a sage before he can become a christian. The truth of religion depends altogether upon facts—facts which can be apprehended as easily by the unlearned as by the wise. I well know, my friends, that the real merits of this question do not rest where, for the sake of an issue, I have proposed to rest them ; but I repeat, that I will rest the whole merits of this controversy upon my opponent's being able to establish the assertion, that the idea of God is a fancy. I know very well that it is very difficult to render a clear and perspicuous demonstration of an abstract and metaphysical hypothesis. Were we as well acquainted with the extent and measure of our intellectual as we are with those of our physical powers, we could soon settle this controversy. Were I to tell you that I had seen a man take up the Andes in his hand and cast them into the ocean, you would unhesitatingly say that it was false ; because you know by experience, and the most extensive observation, that this is far beyond the measure of any human strength. But when I say that a man could as easily, by the exercise of his own native, inherent, unaided human strength, take up the mountains and cast them into the sea, as he could originate the idea of a God, you would feel a great deal more hesitancy in giving a plump negative to the assertion—you would immediately say this is a question of much more difficult solution than the former—it is abstract and metaphysical : it is *de rebus spiritualibus*, and not *de rebus naturalibus*.

I did not propose those questions yesterday with a view to puzzle my opponent. As far as I have been able to penetrate these subjects I am conscious that no man can solve these questions, but by an admission of the principle for which I contend. These questions were therefore, tendered to my friend in order to bring his own mind to reason upon them, and thereby enable it to arrive at logical conclusions. But I cannot consent to go on with the discussion in this way. I am willing to receive and examine Mr. Owen's ablest arguments in support of his cause. And I do wish for his own sake, and for the sake of truth, that he would come out in his whole argumentative strength in advocacy of his proposition. More good than Mr. Owen has ever dreamed of may result from a correct and fair investigation of this subject. I should like to be told why we should not, on Mr. Owen's principles, love stones and trees as well as men.

Mr. Owen has told us, moreover, that the Millennium is coming, when we shall all be *independent;* that is, in his acceptation, we shall have like sympathy for trees and stones as for each other. Am I

not warranted in calling all this impertinent declamation? But, I must resume my disquisition upon the old skeptics, as I have nothing before me in Mr. Owen's last speech, pertinent to our discussion. When my last half hour expired I was going on to show how the skeptics involve everything in mysticism. No skeptics ever could agree upon any system of human nature.

"Man is the work of nature," says the philosopher. But who, or what is *nature?* Of her he appears as ignorant as the deist of his "God of nature." He attempts to define nature: "Nature, in its most extended signification, is the great whole that results from the assemblage of different matter, of its different combinations, and of their different motion which the Universe presents to view." But Nature, the mother of us all, is here said to be a child of *matter and motion.* The sage defines her again: "Nature, in a less extended sense, or considered in each being, is the whole that *results* from its essence; *i. e.*, of the properties, combinations, motions, or different modifications by which it is distinguished from other beings." This makes the nature of each being the *result* of its own essence!! But we shall hear his definition of one being, viz: *man:* "Man is, in the whole, the result of the combination of certain matter, endowed with peculiar properties, of which the arrangement is called organization, and of which the essence is to *feel*, to think, to act, and, in short, to move after a manner distinguished from other beings with which he can be compared." Now if nature be something different from matter, motion, or the essence of particular bodies, can *these* be called nature, or can *she* be called the author of them!! But the sage, feeling the darkness and confusion of his former definitions, gives an extra definition in the way of an admonition: "Whenever I make use of the expression 'nature produces an effect,' I have no intention of *personifying* that nature which is purely an abstract being."

But he talks of the LAWS OF NATURE. Is she a lawgiver? The laws of a stone are just as puissant as the laws of Nature. Is Nature the governor, and the governed—the *agent* and the *patient*—or is the term *law* equivalent to the term *nature?!*

There are some who glory in being *rational*, and contemn others as *irrational.* The rationals censure the irrationals for their ignorance of the system of religion which they embrace, or rather, for having any system which they do not fully comprehend. After this, who would expect to hear a person professing to teach and to admire what he calls the SYSTEM OF NATURE, confessing in piecemeal his ignorance of the whole of it? Yet such is the author of the System of Nature.

We shall now state the dogmas and mysteries of atheism:—

First. Of the dogmas.

1. "The Universe presents but *matter* and *motion.*"

2. "From the action and reaction of the beings which the Universe contains, result a series of causes and effects."

3. "Man is the work of Nature."

4. "Motion is guided by constant and invariable laws."

Now for a confession of ignorance on those dogmas and topics connected with them—

CONFESSED IGNORANCE OF ATHEISTS.

1. "The different principles of each of these motions are unknown to us, because *we are ignorant* of what originally constitutes the essence of these beings. We know bodies only in the mass; *we are ignorant* of their intimate combinations, and the proportions of those combinations."

2. "If we have a mind to find *the principle of action* in matter and the *origin of things;* it is forever to fall back into difficulties, and to absolutely abridge the examination of our senses, which only can make us know and judge of the causes capable of acting upon them, or impressing on them motion."

3. "We know nothing of the elements of bodies."

4. "The mind most practiced in philosophical observations, has frequently the chagrin to find that the most simple and most common effects *escape all his researches* and remain *inexplicable to him.*"

5. "*We are ignorant* of the ways of nature, or of the essence of beings"—"Let us therefore content ourselves with avowing that *nature has resources which* WE KNOW NOT OF."

6. "If they ask FROM WHENCE MAN HAS COME, we reply, that experience does not enable us to resolve this question, and that IT CANNOT REALLY INTEREST US. It suffices for us to know, that man exists, and that he is constituted in a manner to produce the effects of which we see him capable."

7. "PERHAPS this earth is a mass, detached in the course of time, from some other celestial body—PERHAPS it is the result of those spots, or those incrustations which astronomers perceive on the sun's disc; which from thence have been able to diffuse themselves into our planetary system—PERHAPS this globe is an extinguished, or displaced comet, which heretofore occupied some other place in the regions of space; and which, consequently, was then in a state to produce beings very different from those which we find in it now."

8. "We CONJECTURE that the human species is a production peculiar to our globe, in the position in which it is found, and when this position shall happen to be changed, the human species will change, or will be obliged to disappear."

9. "IT IS PROBABLE that man was a necessary consequence of the disentangling of our globe, or one of the results of the qualities or properties of the energies of which it was susceptible—that he was born male and female—that his existence is co-ordinate with that of the globe."

10. "The PRIMITIVE MAN did *perhaps* differ more from the actual man, than the quadrupeds differ from the insects."

11. "It is *impossible for us to know* what they will become, as to know what they have been."

12. "It is not given to man to know his origin; to know the essence of things, nor to know their first principles; but we may conclude that he has no just reason to believe himself a privileged being in nature."

13. "We know not the nature of magnetism, of electricity, of elasticity, of attraction, or cohesion."

14. "The most simple motions, the most ordinary phenomena, the most common modes of action, are *inexplicable mysteries*, of which we shall never know the first principles."

This, which is but a sample, we must give as a specimen of the ignorance confessed by those who pretend to believe that christianity is based upon the ignorance of mankind. I have extracted these fourteen assertions in their own words.

NATURAL MYSTERIES OF ATHEISM.

1. The origin of Matter.
2. The principle of *motion* in Matter.
3. The specific origin of the Earth.
4. The *origin* of Man.
5. The *elements* of Bodies.
6. The *nature* of Magnetism.
7. The *nature* of Attraction.
8. The *nature* of Repulsion.
9. The *nature* of Cohesion.
10. The *nature* of Elasticity.
11. The *nature* of Electricity.
12. The destiny of the whole or any part of the Universe.
13. Our belief, in no case, depends upon our will, therefore, faith or belief, is necessary; consequently, original and divine.
14. Knowledge, belief, and opinion, are all *involuntary*. The desire to know, a natural principle, has no effect upon our will; our consequent volition has no influence upon our knowledge.

The *materialist* has to confess as much ignorance and to believe more mysteries than the christian. And this is neither the half nor the worst of it; he has to teach, admit, and contend for a number of absurd mysteries, beside those which he acknowledges, which, in fact, are much greater than any taught in the most corrupt schools of christian priests. But they are of another kind, and therefore are not to be compared.

1. The *Materialist* asserts, "*That it cannot really interest man to know his origin.*" This is contrary to universal experience, and to the ardent desires of rational nature.

2. The materialist asserts that "man has no just reason to believe himself a privileged being in nature." This is also contrary to experience, and the most common observation.

3. He has, in any attempt to account for the origin of man, to

suppose an absurdity; namely, that there were an infant male and female born or produced co-ordinate with the existence of the earth, and that these had no parent; consequently, could not possibly arrive at maturity. Experience has taught us that the first pair must have been adults when first ushered into being.

4. He has to suppose, contrary to all experience, and to all history, that man was not originally like the species now.

5. That there was first an acorn or a seed before there was a tree to produce it. Doubtless all the vegetable, as well as the animal kingdom was first in its prime before there was a seed fell into the earth.

6. He is also compelled to suppose matter and motion originally possessed of powers of which they are now totally divested, and, therefore, has to reason against all experience. Nature cannot now produce a new genus or species in the animal or vegetable kingdom. By what rational evidence can it then be shown that ever she possessed such a power?

7. He cannot give any rational account of how the idea of God or a Creator so universally obtained among mankind.

8. He cannot show one single instance of either contingency or the blind laws of nature operating to produce a poem like Homer's Iliad, or Milton's Paradise Lost; to produce a house like this one; a steamboat; a ship; a watch; human eye; a hand; or a picture. Why then assert, contrary to all experience and observation, that nature produces the power of creating anything?

The capital sins of ignorance, confessed by the materialist, amount to twice seven. The *natural mysteries* of their creed are also at least twice seven. And the artificial mysteries which they have recently superadded amount to seven. In this enumeration, we have followed their method: we have not gone into the detail. The prominent items I have given in their own words. But there is one *mystery* that ought to be added, which is more than equal to that of *transubstantiation* in its worst aspect. It is this: *Motion*, say they, is a property of matter. But what gives *regularity* to motion? Why does it choose to move in order, or in any uniform course?

Motion was so *irregular*, at one time, as to form out of two vegetables a man and a woman. They sprang up on the bank of a river in Asia. They grew with their faces toward each other, and when they were fully ripe, a gentle breeze broke them off the stem, and so put them in motion; and thus they formed an early attachment for each other, and have kept in motion ever since. But why motion should have acted so irregularly at that time, and kept so regular ever since, is *the great mystery of mysteries of atheism.*

Before I sit down, I will give you the testimony of Lord Chesterfield, on this creed of the materialists. No man can suppose *him* either a bigot or an enthusiast in religion. He says—

"I have read some of Leed's sermons, and like them very well. But I have neither read nor intend to read those which are meant to

prove the existence of God; because it seems to me too great a disparagement of that *reason* which he has given us, to require any other proof of his existence than those which the whole, and every part, of the creation afford us. If I believe my own existence, I must believe his. It cannot be proved *à priori*, as some have idly attempted to do, and cannot be doubted of *à posteriori*—Cato very justly says: 'And that he is, all nature cries aloud.'"—Elegant epistle.

MR. OWEN'S SIXTH ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman—I expressed, in the previous part of the debate, my total disbelief in the notion that a supreme intelligence would create a devil, knowing what it was about. I asserted nothing about the existence or non-existence of Deity, etc. Now, my friends, I am very desirous to conform to the suggestion of the board of Moderators, and not to digress from the point of discussion immediately before us, except for the purpose of more ample illustration. We are now endeavoring to prove that all religions are founded in ignorance. Mr. Campbell has stated a strong practical fact concerning the sectarianism of the skeptics. But I do not conceive myself in the least bound to depend upon any arguments except those which I bring forward myself. I have not once quoted a Skeptic, Deist, or Atheist to prove one of my positions. I derive my information from a close observation of human nature, and from facts which every one can examine for himself. I have no occasion for any other authority, nor do I wish to resort to any other. For, in my opinion, authority is but of little use, unless it be to give sanction to falsehood and error. It seems that the skeptical opinions of Mirabaud and Paine were at war with each other. Well be it so; for my part I know not what skepticism means, unless it signifies a difference of opinion from the speaker. I am simply *a searcher after, and a lover of truth.* Mirabaud, it seems, has stated that atheism could not make a wicked man good; right enough, according to his notions of human nature and society. But the system which I advocate, is derived from the laws of nature, which will prevent bad men from being formed. Are there not now bad men and women of all religions in the world. Now, I propose to you a principle which shall prevent the formation in future of any bad men and women, and surely this is a superior principle to apply to practice than either religion or atheism, both of which are mere words.

The ninth great law of our nature is, "that the highest health, etc., depends upon the cultivation of our intellectual and other faculties, upon their equal and full development, and upon their temperate exercise." It is this law of our nature that demonstrates that temperance in all things, must be the highest point of human enjoyment. Consequently, the education of youth ought to be directed to give every being the habit of temperance. We all know that we are composed of physical propensities, of intellectual faculties, and of moral feelings, and no human being can enjoy the happiness that

of right belongs to his nature, until all these are properly cultivated from infancy to maturity. We have, therefore, my friends, not a metaphysical discussion to attend to; but an invaluable law of nature directing us to the most beneficial practical result, and declaring to us in the plainest language, that we ought to alter our whole system of society as it is carried on in all countries. In our present system we have, as formerly stated, but two divisions of society, the producer and the non-producer; the one continually attempting to deceive and to prey upon the other, and both having their faculties partially and unnaturally developed. The whole system of the world is, therefore, bad from its foundation. Had we been all trained in the best manner physically and intellectually, what different beings we would have been from what we now are. Why, my friends, under a rational state of society, the expression of every one of our features will be greatly superior to what they now are. I should be sorry to say anything offensive, or unnecessarily to wound the feelings of any one; but it is my duty upon this occasion, to speak the truth for the benefit of society at large, who will either read or hear of these discussions, and to make known the genuine impressions which facts have made upon me; and, therefore, my friends, I tell you plainly, and I hope without offense to any, that I have never yet seen, since I had the power of observing, with my present knowledge upon the subject, any feature in the countenance of any human being, that appeared to express the full character of rationality. And my expectation is, that the generation that shall be trained to be rational, will be in all respects different, and greatly superior in aspect and general character, from the present. More different, indeed, than in your present state of mind, it is possible for you to conceive. When we shall become rational, if I am not greatly deceived, we shall see no feature expressive of dislike, anger, or irritation; no eye that will express want of confidence, or a consciousness that we are attempting to deceive our neighbor. Our faces will become so open that all our real feelings will be expressed in them without the slightest shadow of disguise. Every internal movement of the mind will be distinctly exhibited in the finer movements of the countenance; no uncharitable expression will be felt to leave its impression upon any feature, not one unamiable look, or constrained action, or, consequently, one unamiable gesture in our deportment that will appear ungraceful, will then be discoverable. How will this change beautify our race in the next and succeeding generations! And all this, my friends, is neither visionary nor very difficult of practice. All that is necessary in order to bring about these desirable results, is to discover and understand what manner of beings we are. Our nature, at birth, is a beautiful compound, which can be moulded into the most elegant or misshapen form; but which of these it shall be, depends entirely upon the knowledge that may be speedily acquired by the respective American and European governments. Heretofore, governments and priesthoods have had

the forming of you, and how very inferior in person and mind have your priests and rulers made you! Nevertheless, we cannot be rational, and complain of those who have thus formed us, because they were made to be as ignorant of the right method of training human nature to become rational, as you are now, without additional knowledge upon the subject. This law, my friends, like the other laws, points out to us the importance of infant schools. I do not know whether any of the parties present, have ever seen any of those in practice in the eastern cities, imperfect as they yet are. There are some, I believe, in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. But these infant schools have not been introduced into this country, or latterly into Great Britain, on the principles on which they were originally founded. These infant-schools, as first introduced by myself at New Lanark, five years before they were introduced elsewhere, I believe to be the first practical step that has been taken toward forming the human race to become rational. But the priesthood, through their influence, have been enabled to lay hold upon these institutions, and are now moulding the children within them, to their own purposes. But this mode of proceeding will not do much longer. The spread of knowledge is opposed to it, and too much light will speedily appear upon the subject of education, to permit of so much injury being inflicted upon the rising generation. My friends, when these infant-schools shall be properly directed, they are capable of forming, by comparison with the poor neglected infants of the present day, little angels; for, in these schools, under a rational management, they may be trained to acquire, without any failure, the best dispositions, habits, and manners, and the most useful and valuable knowledge. Such qualifications as these, will make angels of any children, except their wings; but these I cannot promise, for they have not yet been invented for them. But to be again serious, it is certainly most true, that heretofore, men have been quite unconscious of the extent of the infantile powers, and of the effect which, when human nature comes to be known, and well understood, may be produced at a very early period. I have seen several hundred little children assembled together, who were angels in everything except the wings; there was no fighting, no quarreling, no crying; all was peaceful: so that one young female, not more than eighteen years of age, of ordinary acquirements, but having a good disposition, and being fond of children, could with pleasure superintend for several hours through every day, almost from morning to night, 130 of them, from the age of eighteen months up to six years. The infant-schools, when well understood, will be discovered to be a moral improvement of far greater value to society than the steam engine, or, any other ancient or modern physical improvement. But, my friends, I would not have you to introduce these schools until you understand the principles on which they were founded, and upon which only they ought to be established and managed. Had you commenced before this time, you would have commenced in error.

But I hope the time is rapidly approaching, when you shall have no error to contend against; when no part of the population will be longer taught to contend against its own happiness. If, as Mr. Campbell admits, human beings are influenced by the circumstances surrounding them, ought we not to begin at once to study the quality of circumstances around us, in order to ascertain if it be possible to withdraw those which produce a bad effect, and to replace them with others of a superior description. Is there any other practical wisdom in the world? If we be in all cases, to a very great degree, the creatures of circumstances, does it not behoove those who undertake to govern and instruct us, to make themselves well acquainted with the nature and character of those circumstances? I have read much of history, I have traveled in many countries, I have endeavored to bring before me all the present and past transactions of mankind, but I cannot bring to my recollection the government, or the priesthood, which has not entirely neglected this high duty—while this is *by far* the most important duty of both, it is, in all cases, the first business to which they ought to attend. While they remain ignorant of this department, every active measure they adopt will tend only to increase the evils of society; for society is very different now from what it was only a few years ago. It could be governed *by* ignorance, *in* ignorance; it must now be governed by intelligence, and made to be intelligent.

It is of no use for different parties to contend any longer against each other in the field of ignorance, opposing one erroneous system against another. A large mass of the people in many countries has become too well informed to admit much longer of a continuance of these measures. They have discovered the true sources of knowledge and of wealth, and that they are sufficient, under a good and intelligent direction, amply to supply the human race.

As men receive all their knowledge from without, they can be made intelligent and well disposed to all their fellows, by a rational education from infancy to maturity. They can be made wealthy through the knowledge and habits which they may be taught by a rational education directing them to what they require for their happiness, and how to obtain it in the best and most easy manner by a right application of the enormous mechanical and chemical power for the creation of wealth, now at the disposal of society, and which admits of unlimited increase.

But these invaluable sources of knowledge and wealth cannot be applied with advantage for the general benefit of society under the influence of any known religion. Useful, valuable, practical knowledge can proceed only from an accurate knowledge of human nature; and to me it appears that these religions and that knowledge are at variance with each other; that all religions are founded in mysteries beyond human comprehension; that all knowledge is derived from an accurate observation of facts, and just deductions from them, and

proved to be so by their unvarying consistency. It may be also taught by proper methods to be understood by all men.

The twelve fundamental laws of human nature, explain what human nature really is, and the principle by which it ought to be trained and instructed from infancy to maturity, to secure, to every one, superior dispositions, habits, and knowledge.

But each of these laws, when followed out to all their legitimate consequences, is sufficient to prove that all the religions of the world have been founded in ignorance of human nature, and therefore they never have, or can make man intelligent, good, and happy. They all continually endeavor to pursue a course opposite to the nature of man, and, in consequence, both are perpetually violently opposed to each other. And as these religions give an erroneous direction to men's thoughts and feelings, I have been long deeply impressed with the conviction, which has been more confirmed by all I have heard in this debate, "that all religions are not only founded in ignorance of human nature, but they have been and are the real source, through that error, of vice, disunion, and misery of every description; that they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family; and that they can be no longer maintained except through the ignorance of the mass of the people, and the tyranny of the few over that mass."

The world cannot be benefited by the continuance of errors which affect the well-being and happiness of every individual, whatever may be his rank or condition. All are therefore deeply interested in this question between Mr. Campbell and myself. One or both of us must be in error, and the intelligent of all parties ought, for their own sakes, and for the benefit of their less informed fellow-beings, to investigate without partisan feelings, calmly and patiently the principles which each conscientiously believes to be so true that he is lost in conjectures how the other can believe as he says he does believe, and wonders that he has not by his arguments already convinced his opponent of his errors.

To me it appears that there are two most important measures which require the whole attention, and the application of all the best faculties of those who attempt to govern and to instruct the populations of different countries.

The one is to introduce a rational system of education by which the character of *every one* shall be well formed, physically and mentally, from infancy to maturity. The other, to give a right direction to the new scientific powers of production; that an independence, relative to the means of a comfortable and happy existence, may be secured to every individual.

Upon every view that I can give to the subject, it seems to me that the condition of the population of most countries now calls

loudly for the adoption of these measures; that they may be immediately introduced into practice with great benefit to the governors and governed, to the instructors and instructed, and that to secure success both measures should be intimately united and one made to aid the other—indeed it is only by their union; by being so blended together that they shall mutually act and re-act upon each other, that either of them can become practicable. For it is useless and dangerous to enlighten men before they attain the means of securing a happy existence; and it is equally useless and dangerous to give them the means of superfluous abundance without forming them at the same time to become intelligent and virtuous in the proper sense of the term, or, in other words, well disposed in all sincerity to promote the real happiness of all their fellow-beings, not merely in words but in their daily conduct.

Happy will it be for the government and people that shall first introduce this change into practice!

By such examples they will show the means, most delightful too in practice, by which "peace on earth and good-will to men" may be established probably in less than one generation. I could enter into extensive detail upon these very interesting subjects.

[Here the honorable Chairman remarked (without wishing to interrupt Mr. Owen) that, in the opinion of the Moderators, Mr. Owen, in his last address, had wandered from the point of discussion immediately before the disputants and the public. The Board of Moderators suppose that you ought to prove the falsehood of the existing religions before you proceed to the discussion and explanation of your substitute.]

Mr. Owen replies—That he has intimately studied man, and finds him entirely different in his nature from what all religions suppose him to be. If I prove this to the satisfaction of the audience, I apprehend it is entirely unnecessary to involve myself in all the subtilties of the unlimited amount of fables and metaphysics with which the world has been inundated. If I am permitted to prove these five positions in the way I conceive to be consistent with right reason, then I shall be ready to enter into any metaphysical disquisitions that may be necessary to elucidate any other truth.

Mr. Chairman said in reply to Mr. Owen—It is not the wish of the Moderators to dictate to you the course which you ought to pursue. The Moderators are perfectly willing that you should rely upon any course of argument which you may think best calculated to sustain your proposition, viz: "that all religions in the world are inconsistent with human nature, as you find it." The Moderators only meant to say, that while you are discussing the proposition that all religions are false, it would be improper to introduce the *substitute* which you propose.

Here Mr. Owen remarked that he had touched upon the subject of infant schools, and the creation of wealth simply to illustrate that the population of the world were yet ignorant; that they had not

even taken the first step toward training their children to become rational from infancy, or independent in their condition.

MR. CAMPBELL'S SIXTH REPLY.

Not having heard any argument whatever adduced in the last address, pertinent to the subject at issue, and Mr. Owen having dealt only in general assertions concerning human nature; having rejected the validity of all authority, and having admitted that his system is so different from the existing state of things, that we cannot reason from the one to the other—I now feel myself compelled to adopt some other course.

Mr. Owen places me in a very singular predicament. Had I selected a proposition and pledged myself to prove it, I should have felt myself bound, by all controversial rules, to keep to that proposition, until I had either established it, or failed in the attempt. And if, on the other hand, my opponent had taken up an affirmative proposition, and confined himself to the proof of it, I should have felt myself bound to attend to every fact, argument, and demonstration adduced in its support, and either have rebutted them, or acknowledged my inability so to do. But in the singular predicament in which I am placed by Mr. Owen's course, unless I were to speak of angelic infants, with, or without wings; unless I should speak of subjects derogatory to the dignity of this discussion, I see not how I can take any notice of my opponent's last address. It is necessary that we should reciprocally reach some tangible point of disputation. I trust that Mr. Owen is only keeping back his strong arguments all this while. But if any stronger argument is yet to be offered, for the sake of the audience, as well as for my own sake, I should really be obliged to Mr. Owen if he would soon adduce it.

If Mr. Owen possesses that moral courage or boldness for which his friends so much admire him, he ought to avow at once that all ideas of Deity, and all other spiritual existences, are entirely at variance with the beneficent objects which he has in contemplation to consummate. Let us suppose that Mr. Owen thinks and assumes that the idea of the providence of God, and all the ideas inseparably connected with a belief in the christian religion, are diametrically opposed to the consummation of his beneficent objects. Assuming this to be Mr. Owen's real opinion, then it behooves him to give us some sort of argument, proof, or illustration, calculated to eradicate such ideas from our minds. If Mr. Owen thinks that our religious (superstitious) ideas, and his social ideas can never exist together in the same mind, this ought to be his course. If he has no objection to the ideas which we entertain of spiritual existences, and of our relation to a spiritual world, he ought to concede to us the right of making deductions from them. But if, on the other hand, he conceives that these ideas interpose an impassable barrier to the admission of his principles into our minds, he ought to use his best exertions to banish these hostile ideas. But Mr. Owen not only eludes

the *onus probandi*, which every advocate of an affirmative proposition tacitly and impliedly undertakes, but he cautiously avoids advancing anything for his opponent to disprove.

Now I am at a loss to reconcile this equivocal course with what I must think is the honesty, frankness, and candor of my friend's character and disposition. I have advanced certain propositions predicated of all the popular systems of philosophy. I have inquired of my opponent whether he would admit the philosophy of Locke, or Hume, or of any of the philosophers of ancient or modern times, on the subject of man's intellectual and moral powers. To these requests I have not been able to elicit either assent or negation. I am still willing on these topics to join issue with Mr. Owen upon the doctrines of any skeptical philosopher of any school. But as yet he has not asserted one single first principle, except that "we are the creatures of circumstances." I reasonably expected that he would admit, or except to my analysis of the powers of the human mind; but Mr. Owen, according to his *modus operandi*, pretermits all notice of that analysis. Does my opponent approbate my analysis? Does he assent to its correctness? If so, his conclusions are at variance with his premises. I am apprehensive that it will be necessary for me to do one of two things—either, to institute a regular argument demonstrative of this position, viz: "*that it is impossible for man to originate any of those supernatural ideas which are developed in the christian religion;*" that is to say, I shall have to undertake to prove *philosophically* that man could not invent, or originate the idea of a God, a Spirit, a future state, or any of the positive institutions of religion; that he never could have invented or originated the ideas inseparably connected with the word *priest, altar, sacrifice*, etc., ergo, that these ideas and the words used to express them, are derivable only from an immediate and direct revelation; man having no power, according to any philosophic analysis of his intellectual powers, to originate any such ideas. This I must do, or take up the great question, "*Whether we have reasonable grounds to believe the truth and certainty of the apostolic testimony.*" To one or other of these topics I shall be compelled to call your attention, if my opponent will not adopt some systematical logical course of argumentation, bearing directly upon the point at issue. One or other of these topics, if permitted, I intend to take up in the afternoon.

We have taken a peep into the different systems of the *Free Thinkers* (as they glory in the name) of the ancient and modern schools. And now let me ask: What have the skeptics to propose us in room of the Bible? Can they concur in any substitute? Can they offer any system of Nature, or of human nature? If they recommend *theism*, they cannot find any two of themselves to concur in defining that system. If they would have us become *atheists*, they cannot harmonize in any one scheme, on which men can reason. Indeed, Mr. Owen seems to think that all that is necessary is to pull down christianity by reiterated assertions, that it is predicated of

principles at variance with the nature of man. And having demolished this *palladium* of all refined social enjoyment, and having extinguished all the lights of immortality, man must not dare to think of his *origin*, because it does not "*interest* him to know anything about it;" nor must he think of his *destiny*, as that cannot afford him any relish for the animal enjoyments of his system. He must not act either the philosopher, or the christian. If he were to reason from effect to cause, he might be confounded with some insoluble difficulty upon such a question as: Whether the first man was an infant or an adult; or, Whether there was an acorn or an oak first. Such questions as these might lead him to others more unanswerable still; as, Whether the first man invented language himself, and taught it to his offspring, or whether there was a convention of men co-existent, who agreed upon names for everything, before any of them could speak? But it will be best under the new economy, to teach, that it is a sin, or something worse, for persons to have, or to indulge, any curiosity upon such topics.

Although the skeptic may, in argument, be constrained to admit that no innate appetite or desire in man is so strong as the desire of knowledge; yet under the new system, he must be taught to view the gratification of this desire as a sin against his own happiness if ever it transcends the properties of matter. Everything about spirit and a spiritual system must be the forbidden fruit in the gardens of sensual pleasure, which are to be cultivated under the new social system.

These systems of Nature and human nature, framed by physical men, who have just their five senses to guide them, teach man to consider himself by no means a privileged being amidst the animals around him. He must not consider himself superior to the horse on which he rides; for if he should think about superiority, this might involve him in great difficulties, and cause him to inquire to whom he might be indebted for the high rank he occupies in the scale of being. And whether he be superior or inferior, is a problem with them which has not yet been satisfactorily solved. And should it ever occur to him that there is a real difference in animals, not only in figure and size, but also in sagacity, in genius, taste, imagination, reason, etc.; he must never inquire why or how the earth once threw up a small crop of each, and never attempted to do it a second time: and by what peculiar concourse of chemical agents and atoms, the first crop were men; and the last, apes, or insects.

Nothing astonishes me more than the impotency of philosophy in all matters and things pertaining to a spiritual system: to the origin and nature of all those relations in which mankind stand to the Creator and toward one another as immortal beings. And how men reared and educated within the precincts of revelation, can exhibit so many raw and undisciplined ideas of human nature, to say nothing of the future and unseen world, is still more astonishing. To hear all the skeptics, too, in one conclave assembled, declare their perfect

ignorance of the fundamental springs and principles of all their own laws of nature; and, indeed, of the origin of all things and their destiny: to see them predicate all their system of infidelity of such acknowledged ignorance—and then upbraid christianity, as if predicated of ignorance of God and man, is a contradiction, or inconsistency, for which I can find no parallel in the whole range of my acquaintance with men and things. If, as they confess, they neither know, nor can know, the origin of this earth and all things upon it, how or why do they presume to deny the Mosaic account of it!! They profess not to know anything about it; why, then, attempt to deny, or oppose the only account of it in the world, which, without philosophy, but with the authority of a sacred historian, presents a credible history of it.

And here it is not unworthy of remark that all the traditionary accounts of the origin of the universe extant in all nations, evidently, however, stolen from the Mosaic, pretend not to offer their account as a *theory*, but as a *narrative* derived from the original inhabitant of the world, who had it first of all from the Creator himself. I presume the world was more than *three thousand years old* before there was a single theory offered, or a speculation upon its origin. All the ancient accounts are *narratives*, either in prose or verse. No explanations are offered—no speculations presented. They were not the conclusions of reasoners or philosophers, but the declarations of a witness, and of a superhuman one — not a single traditionary account which does not presuppose an original witness of the creation, and imply the necessity of a supernatural revelation upon the origin of things. The first philosophers who presumed to theorize upon this subject, if they demonstrated anything, clearly demonstrated this, that their conclusions were *wiser* than their premises. In other words, that they were in possession of previous information upon the subject which they did not derive from reason; and, in defiance of the rules of logic, they had more truth in the deductions than in the data which they assumed. They always remind me of a lad at school who had stolen a penknife, and when pushed by his examiners to account for the knife found in his pocket, in answer to the question *How he came by the knife*, answered, that he "*found it growing on a tree.*" As just and logical is the reason given for many of those ideas declared by philosophers to have been derived from their own reasonings, but evidently stolen from other sources, either from the volume of Revelation itself or from streams flowing from it.

What an honor does the philosopher Mirabaud bestow on the *savages*, who, he says, invented all the religions in the world! vol. 2, p. 13, 14: "In short, it is upon these rude foundations, that are built all the religious systems of the world: although invented originally by savages, they have yet the power of regulating the fate of the most civilized nations. These systems, so ruinous in their prin-

ciples, have been variously modified by the human mind, of which the essence is to labor incessantly upon unknown objects; it always commences by attaching to them a very great importance, which afterward it never dares examine coolly."

Priests and *savages*, with him, are the most puissant characters. In spite of all the philosophers, from Epicurus down to Mr. Owen, the priests and the savages give laws and customs, religious and moral, to the most civilized nations of the globe. One would expect, upon this theory, to find that the nearer man approached the savage state the more exact his views of all religious relations, duties, and obligations! And if this be true, the converse must; the greater the philosopher, the less the saint; the more civilized, the less religious is man. I must here give Hobbes credit for one truism. "If men," says he, "found their interest in it, they would doubt the truth of Euclid's Elements." I would add, they will, for the same reason too, believe almost anything — *even that savages civilized the world!*

As the hour of adjournment has almost arrived, I will only add another proof of Bacon's maxim, viz: "*that the worst of all things is deified error,*" taken from the materialist Mirabaud. It is his deification of nature:—

"We cannot doubt the power of nature; she produces all the animals we see, by the aid of the combination of matter which is in continual action; the harmony that subsists between the parts of these animals is a consequence of the necessary laws of their nature and of their combination; as soon as this accord ceases, the animal is necessarily destroyed. What becomes then of the wisdom, of the intelligence, or the goodness of the pretended cause to whom they ascribe the honor of this so much boasted harmony? These animals, so marvelous, which are said to be the work of an immutable God, are they not continually changing, and do they not always finish by decaying? Where is the wisdom, the goodness, the foresight, and the immutability of a workman who appears only to be occupied with deranging and breaking the springs of those machines which are announced to us as the *chefs d'œuvres* of his power and of his ability? If this God cannot do otherwise, he is neither free nor omnipotent. If he changes his will, he is not immutable. If he permits those machines, which he has rendered sensible, to experience pain, he wants goodness. If he has not been able to render his works more solid, it is that he wants the ability. In seeing that animals, as well as all the other works of the divinity decay, we cannot prevent ourselves from concluding therefrom, either that everything Nature does is necessary, and is only a consequence of its laws, or that the workman who made it is destitute of plan, of power, of stability, of ability, of goodness."—P. 144, v. 2.

"Nature is the cause of everything; she is self-existent; she will always exist; she is her own cause; her motion is a necessary con-

sequence of her necessary existence; without motion, we could have no conception of nature; under this collective name we designate the assemblage of matter acting in virtue of its own peculiar energies."—P. 176, vol. 2.

"Let us keep ourselves to the nature which we see, which we feel, which acts upon us, of which, at least, we know the general laws. If we are ignorant of her detail, and the secret principles which she employs in her complicated works, nevertheless, let us be certain that she acts in a permanent, uniform, analogous, and necessary manner. Let us, then, observe this nature; let us never quit the routine which she describes for us; if we do, we shall infallibly be punished with numberless errors, with which our mind would find itself blinded, and of which numberless sorrows would be the necessary consequence. Let us not adore, let us not flatter after the manner of men, a Nature who is deaf, and who acts necessarily, and which nothing can derange the course. Do not let us implore a whole which can only maintain itself by the discord of elements, from whence the universal harmony and the stability of the whole has birth. Let us consider that we are sensible parts of a whole destitute of feeling, in which all the forms and the combinations are destroyed after they are born, and have subsisted for a longer or shorter time. Let us look upon nature as an immense elaboratory which contains everything necessary for her to act, and produce all those works which are displayed to our eyes. Let us acknowledge her power to be inherent in her essence. Do not let us attribute her works to an imaginary cause, which has no other existence than in our brain. Rather let us forever banish from our mind a phantom calculated to disturb it, and to prevent our pursuing the simple, natural, and certain means which can conduct us to happiness. Let us, then, re-establish this nature, so long mistaken in her legitimate rights; let us listen to her voice, of which reason is the faithful interpreter; let us impose silence on that enthusiasm and imposture which, to our misfortune, have drawn us aside from the only worship suitable to intelligent beings."—Page 178, vol. 2.

Who preaches *implicit faith* and *blind adoration* now? The infatuated sage tells you that you must believe without evidence; that Nature never errs—even when mysteries impenetrable hide her operations! And you must worship and adore his goddess, just because she is blind and cannot see you — because she is deaf and cannot hear you! But to suppose that Nature is either rational, good, or kind, would be most abhorrent to all his philosophy. *Blind Fate* and *inexorable Necessity* is all that is to be feared, loved, adored, hated, or what you please. You owe her nothing; and, after all, she is a "*pure abstract being*," who has no existence save in the brain of such crazed philosophers! *Sic transit gloria philosophiæ!* But, if permitted, this afternoon, we will see what right reason or true philosophy teaches on this subject.

MR. OWEN'S SEVENTH ADDRESS.

My Friends—In furtherance of our object, which is to prove that all religions have been founded in error, I proceed to expound the tenth law of our nature, which is: "That the individual is made to possess and acquire the *worst* character, when his organization at birth has been compounded of the most inferior propensities, faculties, and qualities of our common nature, and when so organized, he has been placed from birth to death, amidst the most vicious or worst circumstances." This, my friends, is the law of nature that teaches the origin of evil in man. Man becomes an evil being when his original organization is imperfect; and when, in addition thereto, he is placed amid vicious or unfavorable circumstances. But can the individual justly or rationally be blamed, because his organization has been thus imperfectly formed? Can he be rationally censured because, with this imperfect organization, he has been so unfortunate as to be cast into the vortex of the most vicious and deteriorating circumstances? And against poor human nature thus unfortunately organized, and thus unhappily circumstanced, what has the ignorance of the world done? Why, it has called these objects of a just and rational commiseration and sympathy, all manner of hard names, and inflicted upon them all manner of injustice. In addition to the disadvantage of their *mal-organization;* in addition to the utter impossibility of their resisting the vicious impressions which these unfortunate circumstances have imposed, the laws and the ignorance of all countries heap upon those poor unfortunates, pains, penalties, and every kind of evil. Whereas, had we but known what manner of beings we are, immediately on discovering a fellow-being thus unfortunate in his organization, instead of visiting him with penalties and persecution, we should become fourfold more kind and attentive to him, endeavoring to make amends by our experience and knowledge for his mal-organization. But instead of this rational course of conduct, the ignorance of man has done everything in its power to make bad worse. There has been no eye to pity, there has been none to say: We know that you had no control over the formation of this inferior organization; we will, therefore, not call you hard names, but will endeavor to remove from you every deteriorating circumstance. We will place you in circumstances calculated to remedy the evils of mal-organization. Had we been wise and enlightened, had we possessed a true knowledge of the constitution of human nature, this would ever have been the only practice of the world in these cases. But, do any of the religions of the world speak in this language or spirit to such unfortunates? Do they not, on the other hand, denounce the punishment of *hell-fire* upon them?

My friends, if there had existed a spark of true light in the world, such premises, such conclusions, and such practices would never have been dreamed of. Now, where is their demoralizing influence

to be found? How, or wherein, do these laws of our nature lead to one inconvenience in practice? On the contrary, might I not boldly ask: Where is the code of laws, ever invented by ignorant man, to be found, that is at all comparable to them? I call these *Divine* laws. And whenever we shall have the wisdom to form our municipal codes of law upon them, they will be framed not for the punishment, but for the prevention of crime. They will not be written in blood, as all laws now are. And how much easier and how much better is prevention than cure? Under all the religions of the world, all the bad passions, and all the inferior feelings of our nature, have been arrayed in arms against that portion of our fellow-beings who are the most legitimate and rational objects of extraordinary care and tenderness, sympathy and compassion. Under every rational subject it is plain that these badly organized and unhappily circumstanced individuals, instead of being persecuted and tortured, ought to have been most commiserated and attended to. Whether would it be better, think you, to nip bad habits, propensities, and dispositions in the bud, or allow them, unchecked, to grow up in full vigor or maturity, and then employ a legion of officers of justice, so called (I call them officers of injustice), to imprison, scourge, and sacrifice these unfortunates. I say unhesitatingly, that there is not a particle of justice, rationality, or common sense, in such proceedings.

We will proceed now to the eleventh law of our nature, "That an individual is made to possess and to acquire a medium character when his individual organization has been created *superior*, and when the circumstances which surround him from birth to death produce continued *vicious* or *unfavorable* impressions. Or when his organization has been formed of *inferior* materials, and the circumstances in which he has been placed from birth to death, are of a character to produce *superior* impressions only. Or when there has been some mixture of *good* and *bad* qualities in the original organization, and when it has also been placed through life, in varied circumstances of *good* and *evil*. This last compound has been hitherto the common lot of mankind." Now, my friends, when we look calmly and without prejudice at all the past proceedings of our race, and investigate the practical results produced by all the religions of the world, we find that the utmost they have ever attained to in practice, is to form a very mixed, and very inferior character. And why? Because the authors of these religions were totally unacquainted with human nature; they knew not what it was, nor how to act upon or influence it, except by and through its most inferior qualities.

If the inventors of these religions had possessed any true knowledge they would have devised a very different combination of circumstances from those now found to exist in any part of the world. Having been born in a christian country you must necessarily believe the christian system is superior to any other. But the circumstances which the christian system has permitted to grow up for two

thousand years, have been, in nine cases out of ten, only vicious and deteriorating circumstances for human nature. Those whose leading you have followed, have been blind; they have not known one step of the way to true knowledge and happiness. And you are all at this moment in consequence surrounded with a large portion of the most vicious circumstances. But I rejoice to say, that no very formidable obstacle now interposes to prevent these degrading circumstances from being withdrawn, and replaced by others of the most delightful and beneficial character. I trust, therefore, that another generation will not be allowed to pass away in the midst of such circumstances as those in which we have been trained, and in which we all now live. As soon as this knowledge which we are now endeavoring to develop shall be received into enlightened minds, they must discover the errors in which they have been trained.

And that discovery will operate upon them so powerfully that they will be unable to submit any longer to the degradation of their present circumstances. If indeed we can discover the means of disseminating this light rapidly and extensively over the world, these changes must happen in a much shorter time than you suppose. But I cannot promise the adults of this generation, that it will be practicable for them so far to unlearn that which they have been taught, or to unassociate preconceived ideas, as to enable *them* to enjoy the full benefit of this change. But if circumstances shall prove favorable to my plans, I do think our children, whose characters are yet to be formed, may be placed in circumstances which cannot fail to make them happy; and compel them to receive the best dispositions, manners, and habits. But to effect this important change, you must learn to know what manner of beings you are, to know yourselves, and that thoroughly too. Then all that is false in all religions will vanish; wars will cease all over the world; commerce, for a profit or for individual gain *from* others, will no longer exist; disunion, on account of opinions, or of *anything else*, will no longer be known. Then every child born into the world, will be so educated that, wherever we go, we shall be sure to find a good and intelligent being. Who would not desire to witness this delightful change? Do I propose by the introduction of these principles to rob you of anything you have a value for? Surely the state of society, which I have described, will be of far greater practical benefit and utility than any of you or your ancestors ever enjoyed. Who has any interest in opposing this change? Have the governors, have the clergy, the lawyers, physicians, merchants, the army, or the navy? I say *No*. As *men*, they have a hundredfold greater interest in promoting this change, than as *members* of any class, sect, or party, they can have in opposing it. I, therefore, do not come among you for the purpose of injuring or robbing any one. All I desire is that you should adopt arrangements through which every individual may be placed in a situation greatly to be envied by the most prosperous individual under the present system of things. When we shall thus

acquire an accurate knowledge of ourselves, where will there be any foundation for disunion or difference of any kind? Who, or what can then prevent us all from becoming members of one and the same harmonious, enlightened, happy family? Then we shall not require any of those artificial and inequitable distinctions which now exist to keep man apart from his fellow. Then we shall have millions of friends in whom there is no guile, instead of a few in whom we can place but a partial confidence. When this change shall be consummated, we shall be at home, and have friends in every part of the world. And what is to prevent this change from taking place almost immediately? You have all the necessary materials for it this moment in your possession—you have everything that can be desired to enable you to effect this change—you have powers of production at your control a hundred fold beyond your utmost wants for this purpose; and yet, in consequence of our ignorance of ourselves, and everything around us, we are contending against each other for our daily bread. All our best faculties are at this moment employed in all the professions and businesses of life in vain attempts to buy cheap and sell dear. What an employment for such beings as we are! Beings who are taught to look forward to an immortality in heaven. And yet how many now desirous to attend this discussion, cannot leave their occupations, for the fear of losing the means by which to obtain a subsistence for themselves and families!

My friend, Mr. Campbell, does not at present perceive how these arguments apply to the subject before us, but to me they appear to bear directly upon it; and moreover that there is no other way to understand the argument, except in this mode of treating it. And Mr. Campbell will discover in the sequel, that I have not deviated at all from the object before us, but he (doubtless from the purest motives, and unconsciously to himself) has endeavored to lead me astray from the main object, and to induce me to embark with him into the ocean of metaphysical disquisitions, where we might be tossed about for ten thousand years, and then be no nearer the port than we are now.

I wish to keep your attention to facts, and not to advance one step beyond their plain and obvious or legitimate conclusions. While we thus act, certain knowledge lies directly in our path, and the best practical results must follow. I have directed my mind day by day, and hour by hour, to unravel the mysteries of ignorance in such a manner as to present the lights of true knowledge plainly before my fellow-beings. I have endeavored to sift and re-sift all these principles for which I now contend; I have brought them before the most acute and comprehensive minds; I have urged them to try them through the fire, and to detect, if they possibly could, any error which they contained. For I well know that if they contained one error or one inconsistency, they must fall to the ground. My friends, you should always bear in mind, that truth and inconsistency cannot exist together. But I have traveled many countries, and have

come into collision with minds of the first caliber in the world, but never yet met with that mind which could detect error, fallacy, or inconsistency, in one of these principles. If my friend, Mr. Campbell, can detect error in them, and demonstrate that error to me, I will frankly acknowledge that I have been deceived, and I will most willingly pledge myself both to Mr. Campbell, and to you, my friends, that from the moment I am convinced of the existence of a single error or inconsistency in these principles, I will do as much to promulgate the truth which shall be demonstrated to me, and to expose the error into which I have fallen, as I have done to bring forward the system containing that error. And Mr. Campbell need not fear that there remains on my mind any early impression which can operate to prevent my declaring the whole truth to any assembly in the world.

After proceeding with this subject in the manner I have proposed it, Mr. Campbell will discover that the points which he wishes to seize upon, will be presented in a manner well suited to his own objects and purposes; but I wish to bring forward my subject in such a connection, that all who are capable of reasoning accurately may comprehend it.

MR. CAMPBELL'S SEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—We have heard a great deal on the subject of Mr. Owen's experience, and the pains he has taken to test the soundness and practical utility of his principles. But, as he will not admit the legitimacy of any authority, we cannot admit the experience of Mr. Owen as authority. We must examine the question on its own merits. If Mr. Owen had traveled all over the world, fraught with the combined intelligence of the four quarters of the globe, this ought not to influence our minds in the least. We are here assembled, to examine truth coolly and deliberately on its own evidences. Mr. Owen thinks that I desire to lead him from his object into the mazes of metaphysics; but a single retrospective glance, at the course this discussion has taken, is sufficient to show us that the first metaphysical proposition was introduced by Mr. Owen himself. There cannot be a more metaphysical question than "whether volition has power over belief." I have no *penchant* for metaphysics in the discussion of questions of this sort; nor have I introduced metaphysics into this discussion any further than the nature of the argument itself requires. He has informed us, that the origin of natural evil is to be found in the elements of the human constitution. Now if this be true, every plan of amelioration must be impracticable, unless it be a plan to make man over again. Perhaps Mr. Owen has discovered some new elements, or some way of affecting a new combination of elements, in the human constitution. Perhaps he means the four elements of the old school, and that it is the exact apportionment of these which makes a man good or evil. If this be the meaning of Mr. Owen, it is obviously impossible to ameliorate the condition of man, unless we can change the elements of his

nature. Unless he can apportion the elements of fire, air, earth, and water, he cannot improve our race. If I have mistaken Mr. Owen, I shall be glad to be corrected. But I affirm that if natural evil is to be referred to the quantum of the four elements of the old, or the forty elements of the new school, or to the modification of these elements in the human system, all improvements are impracticable; unless, perhaps, a change of circumstances might have the effect of graduating these elements in other proportions, in the human constitution.

We have been told of the mal-adaptation of christianity to the happiness of man; but I hope to be able to show that religion is as admirably adapted to the constitution of human nature, as the eye is to light, or the ear to sound. And I will further attempt to prove that the Author of the Universe must also be the author of religion, because both are predicated of the same fundamental principles; or, in other words, that the Almighty predicated religion and the universe of the same principles. I presume that if Mr. Owen did understand the christian religion, he would not have a solitary objection to it. He may have called popery *christianity*, and identified the christian religion with papal enormities.* But let the christian religion be taught in its purity, and cordially embraced, and it will exalt man higher, and render him incomparably more happy than Mr. Owen has ever conceived of.

The *gnothi seauton* of Solon, or "*Know thyself*," is what I desire as cordially as Mr. Owen. I am desirous to analyze the mind and the senses, and thus to develop man. Has Mr. Owen exhibited in

* The following note from Mirabaud will prove, if proof be wanted, that the atheists or materialists are most grossly ignorant of what christianity is. They have called *antichrist* and the *papal apostasy* by the name of christianity; and suppose that, in attacking and opposing this, they prove christianity a fable. As well might they ascribe darkness to the sun, or death to life. This materialist says: "The religion of Abraham appears to have originally been a theism imagined to reform the superstition of the Chaldeans; the theism of Abraham was corrupted by Moses, who availed himself of it to form the judaical superstition. Socrates was a theist, who, like Abraham, believed in divine inspirations; his disciple, Plato, embellished the theism of his master with the mystical colors which he borrowed from the Egyptian and Chaldean priests, and which he modified himself in his poetical brain. The disciples of Plato, such as Proclus, Jamblichus, Plotinus, and Porphyrius, etc., were true fanatics, plunged in the most gross superstition. In short, the first doctors of the christians were Platonists; who combined the judaical superstition, reformed by the Apostles or by Jesus, with Platonism. Many people have looked upon Jesus as a true theist, of whom the religion has been by degrees corrupted. Indeed, in the books which contain the law which is attributed to him, there is no mention either of worship, or priests, nor of sacrifices, nor of offerings, nor of the greater part of the doctrines of actual christianity, become the most prejudicial of all the superstitions of the earth. Mahomet, in combating the polytheism of his country, was only desirous of bringing back the Arabs to the primitive theism of Abraham and of his son Ishmael, and nevertheless Mahometanism is divided into *seventy-two* sects. All this proves to us that theism is always more or less mingled with fanaticism, which sooner or later finishes by producing ravages."

his plan anything like a design, or desire, to investigate the physical and intellectual man? Has he taken hold of my analysis of his powers, submitted with the hope of eliciting such investigation? I am willing, yea, desirous to take up the creature man, and analyze him corporeally and mentally; and thus obey the mandate of the philosopher and the apostle—"*Know thyself.*"

He asked you, my friends, of what he would rob you! His motives are doubtless pure. But of what *would* he rob you? Why, my friends, all the attacks that were ever made upon man's dearest rights, and most valued treasures, are mere petty larcenies, compared to the robbery he would commit! Of what would he rob us? Why of the hope of immortality!—of that alone,

> "Amid life's pains, abasements, emptiness,
> The soul can comfort, elevate and fill!"

Now, are thrones, principalities, and powers—is the empire of the world and the fame of all ages—equivalent to the *mere hope of living forever?* The materialist takes us out of the earth, and thither he consigns us back again. But where is the man of unperverted, unsophisticated rationality, who would not give up all the world for the hope of an immortality in heaven?

> ——"Rich hope of boundless bliss!
> Bliss past man's power to paint it, Time's to close!—
> This hope is earth's most estimable prize;
> This is man's portion, while no more than man:
> Hope, of all passions, most befriends us here;
> Passions of prouder name befriend us less.
> Joy has her tears, and transport has her death:
> Hope, like a cordial, innocent though strong,
> Man's heart, at once, inspirits and serenes,
> Nor makes him pay his wisdom for his joys;
> 'Tis all our present state can safely bear,
> Health to the frame; and vigor to the mind!
> A joy attempered! a chastised delight!
> Like the fair summer evening, mild and sweet!
> 'Tis man's full cup, his paradise below!—
> A bless'd hereafter, then, or hoped or gained,
> Is all,—our hope of happiness!"

I have now adverted to all the matter offered by Mr. Owen, that, at this time appears to require my notice. I should now proceed as proposed this forenoon, but from some hints I find it expedient not yet to dismiss the mysteries of atheism, particularly with a reference to one point on which skeptics of all schools declaim so much. They will make *experience* the standard, law, and measure of their belief. I will, in part, traverse the area of *mysteries* a second time.

We have been discussing the mysteries of atheism. They are either natural or artificial. In the original term [*mysterion*] means nothing but a *secret*, and when divulged it loses the name of mystery. By *natural* mysteries we mean natural secrets. These mysteries are not of my creation; they have been collated from the speculations

of the atheists, from their own confessions. The secrets atheists are ignorant of, are;—the *origin of matter*. This they declare to be inexplicable. The natural principle of mobility with which they acknowledge matter to be endowed; the specific origin of the earth; here they acknowledge themselves at fault. I have given you already three *perhapses* of Mirabaud. They say they "cannot comprehend the natural mysteries of any bodies." While they acknowledge the existence of the magnetic power, they confess ignorance of the nature of it. The principle of attraction, the most pervading law of matter, they say they know not. They know nothing of the great law of repulsion, nor of the law of cohesion, by which particles of matter adhere in defiance of the general law of attraction. They confess their ignorance of the nature of the law of elasticity, and so of the law of electricity. The destiny of the whole, or any part of the universe, is to them unknown. Atheists make all these concessions.

When we take a view of these items, we discover that all the operations of nature are embraced by these physical principles, and atheists declare that they know nothing about it. Now to these Mr. Owen has added that our belief in no case depends upon our will—the consequence of which law is, that faith is as *necessary* as the law of attraction and must therefore be divine; faith must be with him a *divine law of nature*. Does not this truth follow out most legitimately? He affirms that faith is as *necessary* as the action of a mill-wheel; therefore it is a "*divine* principle," and on the same principle the evidences on which faith is founded, must be divine. But knowledge, belief, and opinion are all involuntary!

Now is this desire of knowledge a natural principle, and has it no effect upon the will? And has our consent or volition no influence upon our knowledge? These are two *artificial* mysteries.

Now what is the conclusion from these premises? Is it not that the materialist has to confess as much ignorance of his own system, and believe more mysteries than the christian? He has also to contend for artificial mysteries, each of which is absurd—artificial mysteries which are greater than any that ever have been taught in the most corrupt schools of christianity.

The materialist affirms that "*it cannot really interest man to discover his specific origin*. I have no doubt that this dogma was adopted to avoid a difficulty which they knew was invincible. It is conceded that if the materialist's system be true, it is impossible for us to account for our origin—that is a question beyond the utmost reach of human intellect. Therefore to suit the exigency of their speculative scheme, they have the temerity to assume that it cannot rationally interest mankind to know aught about their specific origin—that the stream of human vitality was not worth tracing to its source. Now we are often obliged to appeal to the *experience* of man; it is the grand *argumentum ad hominem*. I will, therefore ask the whole world, every man, woman, and child in it, if the principle of curiosity

be so intensely active upon any other point of human inquiry, or human investigation, as it is in tracing up this stream of vitality to its fountain, in order to ascertain the specific origin of the species? It is a point which elicits some of the earliest development of infantile curiosity, or love of knowledge. "*Who made me?*" "*Whence came I?*" are among the first questions put by the infant catechist to his seniors. This monstrous atheistical assumption opposes itself to the most ardent passions of the rational man. There is no animal appetite in man more operative than his moral eagerness in pursuit of knowledge. It makes man a keen hunter—it causes him to neglect his food, his sleep, his ease, and even to forget fatigue, in pursuit of his object. "*Mens agitat molem—et toto se corpore miscet.*" If my opponent so ardently desires that we should know ourselves, let him come out from a school which declares that the *unde derivatur* of man, or the *whence came I*, is matter of no concernment to him. Let him set his face like a flint against a *dictum* like this, "In pursuit of self knowledge you must not begin at the beginning." Let Mr. Owen's principles be admitted, and there is a total blank in this first and most intensely interesting chapter of man's history. It is all obliterated as unworthy of a place in the volume. "It cannot really interest man to know anything concerning his primitive specific origin," is the first artificial mystery; and this is the way that the school to which Mr. Owen belongs eulogizes the oracular precept of "*Gnothi seauton.*" This, I say, is the first artificial mystery, and this has been invented after the manner of mysteries of the church of Rome. The second artificial mystery is, that man has no just reason to believe himself a privileged being in the scale of creation over the bee, the bat, the beaver, the butterfly, or the elephant. Does this comport with your experience? Let the word *experience* be received and interpreted according to its usual, most known, and legitimate acceptation; and I am not afraid to abide by its test. Well, then, I ask you, if it comports with your experience to admit that man has no reason to imagine himself a superior being to a butterfly? But why was this asserted by the atheists? Merely from the necessity of the case. The materialists would never have agitated these mysteries, but for the hard fate which attends their system. They discovered that unsophisticated reason would lead man to discover that he was at the head of creation; that here he stands pre-eminently chief; that he is lord paramount over all the irrational part of creation; that all was *made for him*, and subordinate to him. But of this noted dignity we must be divested to make room for a speculative phantom, which exterminates the germ of all feeling, save that of *pity;* if indeed it leaves that branch of human sympathy unscathed. For in the doctrine of materialism, where can pity find an object? Can I pity a tree when I see it growing crooked, or a stone for the angularities of its shape, or a house for its rude architecture?

But there is a third artificial mystery of the materialists: In any attempt to account for man's origin he has to suppose that there

were an infant male and female produced without parents, who consequently must have perished in infancy. Some materialists have actually supposed that the first pair grew up like two plants, as I have before stated. And when these were developed and began to expand, the leaves became arms, etc., etc., until at length some favorable zephyrs wafted them into each other's arms. They mutually embraced, and thus originated the human family. But in any attempt to account for the origin of man, the modern materialist has to suppose his first ancestors to have been an infant male and female; and if so, incapable of arriving at maturity!

MR. OWEN'S EIGHTH ADDRESS.

My friends, I perceived, during my friend, Mr. Campbell's last address, that none of you would like to be deprived of heaven. I do not recollect that I expressed any intention of taking away any well founded hope of heaven from you. Nor do I know that my assertion denying the existence of, or my opinion that there was a heaven, would make the least difference in the fact. You have, therefore, nothwithstanding all I may have said on the subject, just as good a chance for enjoying heaven as you ever had.

We come now, my friends, to the *twelfth* and *last* fundamental law of human nature, viz: "that the individual is made most superior of his species, when his original organization has been compounded of the best properties, of the best ingredients of which human nature is formed, and when the circumstances which surround him from birth to death are of a character to produce only superior impressions; or in other words, when the circumstances or laws, institutions, and customs in which he is placed, are all in unison with his nature." Now Mr. Campbell misunderstood me about the ingredients of human nature being the origin of *natural* evil. I stated that some of the peculiar errors of some men arose from their individual organization. And I only applied the remark to *human nature*. And surely we cannot derive the natural evil of human nature from any other source than its defective organization.

It is common to say, that such a one is bad by nature; this only means that the individual has not the same compound as others. But whenever we shall understand this subject fully, and discover that the most superior character is produced by a combination of the best organization and circumstances, we then have a very important practical object presented for our attainment. The inquiry then becomes: Do we possess, or can we obtain through this knowledge any influence over the future formation of individuals? I say that we can; and I speak from a knowledge of facts with which all who are in any degree connected with agricultural pursuits are familiar. It is known to such, that there have been vast improvements in the breed of various kinds of animals; that there is a science by which any animal, whether human or irrational, is capable of receiving great improvement at *birth*. But most unfortunately, in consequence

of the general prevalence of ignorance on the subject of the animal man, almost everything that has been done in this matter has had an immediate and direct tendency to deteriorate the infant man *at birth*. But the knowledge of this science, as soon as we acquire it, will instruct us in the unerring method of obtaining the best raw material for the manufacture of man. It is an object of the highest importance to the welfare and happiness of man, that every child should be born with the best physical, intellectual, and moral organization of which his nature is susceptible. There is a science by which all these may be improved before birth. But the time is coming when we shall have very distinct and accurate knowledge upon these particulars; when we shall know how to cultivate the human being in such manner as to present him greatly improved in his organization at birth. But be this as it may, we have at present the power of withdrawing the most unfavorable circumstances from around all human beings from birth, and these circumstances acting upon our infinitely diversified organizations create nine-tenths of the whole character of individuals.

My friends, you have seen many of the society of Friends in this country; you have seen Jews, and you have seen Indians. Now the difference observable between the Quaker, Jew, and Indian, arises solely from the difference of their external circumstances, in their mode of acting, or their respective original organizations. For were we to take the infants of the Quakers and give them to be brought up by the Jews, they would unquestionably make good Jews, and *vice versa*. We shall, therefore, I repeat, have the power as soon as we acquire the requisite knowledge, to influence the character of every child that is born to a greater extent than nine-tenths of its whole character.

And if we of the present generation will not exert ourselves to remove the unfavorable circumstances which now exist, the coming generation ought not to be blamed for their characters being ill-formed. If we love our offspring, if we have any regard for the welfare of future generations, we can no longer remain indifferent about ascertaining the true method of forming and educating them; we can no longer supinely leave them to be the sport of such circumstances, as now pervade the world. No! we shall rather devote our whole heart and soul to the investigating and maturing of this all important subject, which embraces within its scope, all that can be done by man for the improvement of his fellow-beings. My friends, I never consider this subject without feeling that any language which I can command is too feeble to convey an adequate idea of its importance.—Nothing can be plainer than the path you have to pursue; you have nothing to do but make yourselves acquainted with the influence of the circumstances, beneficial or injurious around you, and to withdraw all those which experience shall prove to be detrimental to our nature. This is the *whole duty of man;* let him perform this duty well, with knowledge and with

judgment, and every beneficent result will follow, of course. The performance of this duty is plain and simple; there is no complexity about it, and it will soon be understood by every one. But what has been done for the species upon these rational principles? Why scarcely anything; and nothing at all has been done with a correct understanding of the subject. And yet can we advance a single step toward the attainment of this grand object, until we have acquired an accurate knowledge of ourselves?

Now, my friends, you have heard from me very different doctrines from those which are taught by all the religions of the world. You will, of course, institute a comparison between my developments and those which you have received from your public and appointed instructors — from your spiritual pastors. Well, compare them in their practice. You have already seen and experienced what a state of society the different religions of the world has produced. A little trial will convince you of what can be effected for the good of mankind by the course which I recommend, by attending to facts instead of imagination. Rely upon it, my friends, that if we allow ourselves to be governed by anything but experience, we shall inevitably be led into the mazes of error. When once we diverge from the straight forward path which facts point out, we launch into the wilds of imagination and everything becomes a labyrinth of obscurity, which bewilders the human faculties. Under the old arrangements of society I have never yet met with an individual whose mind was not confused, and whose ideas were not in contradiction with each other.— But ever since I was compelled by circumstances to unassociate my early erroneous ideas, since my mind has been regenerated by the removal of these first impressions to their very foundations, and filled with ideas only consistent with these twelve laws of our nature, I have experienced no jarring elements within me; all has been tranquil and harmonious; there has been nothing to wear out my constitution, or create feelings in my bosom except those unavoidably created by beholding my fellow-beings around me existing in a state of misery, for which I know there exists no other cause but the lamentable ignorance in which they have been trained. Now, my friends, I have endeavored to show you how those twelve fundamental laws of human nature are in direct opposition to the doctrines inculcated and always implied by all the religions of the world. My object is to show you that the two systems are perfect antipodes to each other, that they cannot exist together, that either these twelve fundamental laws of human nature are utterly false, or that all the religions of the world are founded in ignorance and error. It is just as impossible to effect a union between these twelve laws and any system of religion extant, as it is to effect an amalgamation betwen oil and water; there is as little moral affinity in the one case as there is of chemical affinity in the other. The one is all fact derived from what human nature was yesterday, is to-day, and is likely ever to be. The systems of religion on the other hand are derived from the wildest

vagaries of fancy; they are but the air-built fabrics of imagination. I call them air-built, for they have nothing but imagination opposed to natural laws to rest upon, and they have been, in consequence, in a perpetual state of change, and they are still hourly changing in men's minds. And most fortunate it is for you, my friends, that they have no other foundation; for neither in their origin, their tendency, their errors, contradictions, or absurdities, are they at all calculated to produce good conduct in man, or happiness for his race. The greatest blessing that can accrue to man is to demonstrate the ignorance of which all these systems have been predicated, so palpably, that with one accord, mankind should agree to dismiss them from their consideration, as unworthy of the attention of rational beings. But in doing this I would guard you against one danger which may and must arise from the course which must be taken to relieve yourselves from error. My friends, there are three distinct states of society. The first is the common one all over the world, in which human nature has been compelled to believe or profess a belief in some district religion or other, and in this state of society, the characters of individuals have been formed upon the principles of this district religion. Knowing these principles, we can, to a certain extent, judge what the characters of the individuals composing this society are. But when we advance one step toward real knowledge and we can no longer believe these principles, we at the same time withdraw all foundation from the former character formed for us by religious belief; we become like vessels on the ocean without a helm, chart, or compass to steer by; and this is the worst state in which human nature can be placed. But this is the gulf through which we must pass, if the condition of society is to be improved. All we can do is to adopt measures to shorten this critical period as much as possible. And while we are doing this, we are in the second state of society. The third and the superior state of existence will be that in which the individual, having been disabused of the errors implanted by his former religious and other vicious external circumstances, has been taught the correct principles of his nature, when he has been fully and fairly taught what manner of being he is, and his relation to his fellows; then, instead of being worse than the present religious characters of the day, he will rise incomparably above them all; they cannot help sinking almost below estimate in the comparison. In the two first states we shall be irrational. In the third state, everything that savors of irrationality will be withdrawn; in this state there will be, there can be, none who are irrational in their thoughts, feelings, and conduct. Fear not, my friends, that this change in your minds will produce vice instead of virtue.

This change is absolutely necessary, before you can be born again. This is the regeneration which you and past generations have been looking for; and this change can be wrought simply by acquiring a knowledge of these eternal and immutable facts. These twelve fun-

damental laws of human nature (divine in every sense of the word) demonstrate that all the religions of the world have been founded in ignorance, and are opposed to our nature, when that nature shall be fully understood. Now, my friends, I think I may proceed one step farther, and state that these religions are now the only obstacles in the way of forming a society over the earth, of kindness, intelligence, sincerity, and prosperity in the fullest sense of the term; and now I think I may advance another step, and declare that the light is come among us, and that this knowledge can no longer be withheld from the great mass of the people but by the increased tyranny of the few over the many. But the few can no longer tyrannize over the many. Knowledge is power; and knowledge is passing from mind to mind, from country to country like a flood. And this knowledge shall spread from one point as from a center over every portion of the world, until the knowledge of the truth, or, in scripture language, of the Lord, shall cover the earth as the waters cover the seas. This is the knowledge of the Lord, for truth alone is the knowledge of the Lord. It is a knowledge derived from those facts which ever have existed and which exist to this day, as the universal word of the universal cause from whence all effects proceed. When we use the terms Lord, God, or Deity, we use a term without annexing to it any definite idea.—Whenever we use this term we annex to it our own peculiar notions, and in many cases they are strange and wild in the extreme. But, my friends, we do know that it is a law of our nature that we have been so formed that we must acquire all our real knowledge by experience; and all experience declares that man is what he has been demonstrated to be by the twelve fundamental laws of his nature.

MR. CAMPBELL'S EIGHTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—I should be led to conclude from the argument, (if such it may be called) that the error into which my friend has fallen in his whole process of deduction, is exhibited in one assertion in his last address. His mind has dwelt so long on the influence of circumstances that he supposes that if a child of a Quaker were to be removed into the family of a Jew, and *vice versa*, that in process of time, the two children must inevitably imbibe the faith of the families in which they were respectively reared. Now, I have no doubt this would be the case in very many instances, but not universally. And so it is with most of his facts. They are true in very many instances, but are false in his universal application of them. It is illogical to argue *from* particulars, however comprehensive, to such general and universal conclusions. This proposition of my friend's is not a mathematical proposition, which, if true in itself, *must* be true in its most extended or contracted sense. That children may be powerfully impressed by circumstances, is true; but must we therefore conclude this to be an invariable law of our nature, that they are forever doomed to the control of the circum-

stances which surround them at birth? Mr. Owen was himself educated in a family of Episcopalians; is he now an *Episcopalian?* We see that the circumstances of his education could not shackle his active mind. We see that he has broken his chains, and that his emancipated mind now walks abroad, as if it had never known a fetter. This shows that there are some geniuses formed to overcome all disadvantages, to grasp a whole system, as it were, by intuition; that in some minds there is a renovating and regenerating power, paramount even to the influence of circumstances, omnipotent as my friend represents them to be. Now if this be true, in Mr. Owen's regard, why may it not be equally so with respect to countless other persons?

Mr. Owen has attained to the knowledge of certain facts. But on the foundation of a few facts, he has proceeded to erect the superstructure of a whole code of fundamental laws of nature; a divine system of legislation. In fact, to place mankind under a modern Theocracy.

But none of his laws is more immutable, than the one to which we have just referred.

At one time, I would think he was preaching to us concerning the millennium; that he was the herald of a better day. Skeptical as my friend is, I must infer that he is a *believer* in the millennium; and, for aught I know, he may be doing as much as a thousand missionaries to induce it. *Cyrus* knew not the God of Jacob; he had no desire to emancipate the Jews. In like manner, Mr. Owen may possibly be an unconscious instrument in the hands of Providence. He is consoling himself with the anticipation of a better day, and earnestly persuading us to cherish the same anticipation. And from his own premises, I would undertake to prove the certainty of the fulfillment of the prophesies of the New Testament, even, I was about to say, by a mathematical demonstration. Mr. Owen tells us, that wars shall cease; that plenty shall follow us superabundantly as the waters of the Ohio; that there shall be no more need for accumulating property to answer our future exigencies, than there now exists for bottling up the waters of the Ohio. Now all this tends to encourage bright anticipations of future glory and happiness to man. Mr. Owen's *millennium*, we will suppose, has arrived; how long is it to continue? A millennium is a thousand years:—

What now if we should attempt to prove, *arithmetically*, the certainty of prophesies concerning the final consummation of all things? The expectation of christendom is notorious. It is this: that some time soon, perhaps in the present century, a new order of things, in the political and religious relations of society, will commence. That it will pervade the whole human family; that soon after its full introduction, it will continue a *thousand years;* and that soon after its completion, the present state of things will terminate, and the multiplication of human beings cease forever.

Without going minutely into the detail, such is the general expec-

tation of christendom built upon those writings called prophesies; Well now, should we prove by an arithmetical calculation, the certainty of such conclusions relative to the final consummation, what will the skeptics say? I do not know, whether they have been tested upon this point. We shall hear Mr. Owen, when I submit the problem. The premises or data are these: The present population of the earth is estimated, say at *one thousand millions*. Now I will leave it to them, to furnish the data, or state what the population was two, three, or four thousand years ago. They may even furnish me data from the census of any nation of Europe for two, three, four, or five hundred years back. It will give the same result. We shall take the Bible data until they furnish another. But I again repeat, the population of any country, or of the earth, two, three, or five hundred years ago, will give the same result. According to the Bible data, the whole human family, about four thousand years ago, was composed of *eight individuals*, four *males* and four *females*. And to keep our calculation in whole numbers, we shall evacuate Europe and America of all their population, and place them in Asia and Africa, on the population there, which will fill that half of the earth as full of human beings as can subsist upon its surface. We have now got, say the half of our globe empty and the other half full. Now the question is, if *eight* persons in *four thousand* years fill the *one-half* of the earth as full as it can subsist, how long will *one thousand millions* be in filling the other *half?* If in despite of wars, famines, pestilences, and all the waste of human life, under the corruptions of the last four thousand years, such has been the increase of human beings; what would be the *ratio of increase* were all these to cease, and peace, health, and competence be the order of the day for one thousand years? Why my friends, there would not be one half acre of land and water upon the face of the globe for every human being, which would live at the completion of the millennium, or the seven-thousandth year from the creation; what I contemplate from these oracles to be about the end of the present state of human existence. Either, then, some desolation must empty the earth of its inhabitants, or the human race must be extinguished. Logic and arithmetic compel us to the former conclusion, but when we add to logic and arithmetic, the prophesies of holy scripture, we are compelled to embrace the latter. I think no prophesy ever admitted of so certain a calculation, or so exact and definite a computation; in fact, no other oracle in the annals of the world is proved by arithmetic so inevitably and unanswerably as I conceive this to be. If any flaw be in my data or statement of this question, I hope Mr. Owen will detect it, and give me the opportunity to illustrate and corroborate it still more fully.

Mr. Owen's notion seems to be this; that his twelve laws once proved, the christian scriptures must tumble to the ground! I have very little scruple or hesitancy in admitting all his facts, save one,

so far as they apply to the physical constitution of the animal man; and yet I cannot perceive how they contravene any part of christianity. How are we to account for his hallucinations! He supposes that the admission of his twelve facts would prove his five propositions. This is most manifestly a logical error, unless these are identical propositions. Suppose that by the aid of this fact, he had made out the proof of his first proposition, will he repeat the same fact to prove the second proposition? Without the most perfect parallelism and identity in the whole five propositions, how can he expect the same facts which prove one of the five propositions, to prove them all?

There is more couched in this speculation concerning the adolescence or infancy of the primitive stock from which man is derived, than a superficial thinker is perhaps aware of. On the hypothesis that the first pair came into existence, in a state of adolescence, when they first saw light they must have had some information concerning their origin. Infants or adults they must have been. *If* infants they could never have reached maturity; they must have perished for lack of nurture. They must, therefore, have been adults. And when they saw the creation around them, they must have had some knowledge of their origin, of the source from whence they derived their principle of vitality, and their control of the animal tribes around them.

I am now pretermitting the biblical narrative of the primitive origin of man altogether; and assuming, for the sake of argument, a hypothesis. I say, then, that on the hypothesis of adolescence, the primeval pair must have possessed a consciousness of their origin. They must have remembered when they first saw the sun and inhaled the air, and the first time they ate.

Upon the atheistical premises before us, it would be difficult to prove that our first ancestors would have known what or how to eat. The philosopher is not aware of the consequences attendant upon the extinction of the lights of revelation. To these he owes many an idea, which, without them, he would never have conceived. Without the light of revelation, I do not see how the first pair of human beings would have known how or what to eat. Upon what principles would they have set about the process? They might have felt the pain of hunger without knowing either the cause or the cure. And if they could have learned to eat from observation or from feeling, they might not have known *what* to eat. The scriptures, without speculating upon any of the causes of things, state facts, which lead us to think correctly, if we think at all. Hence, we find the revelation was immediate and direct upon this point. God said, "Of the fruit of these *trees* ye may *eat*." There is no system of philosophy except the Christian, which, without pretending to philosophize, inducts us into the reason of things, and that generally by telling us only what was done or said.

But we have now before us this proposition, that the *first man*

must have remembered the first time he saw the sun, ate, drank, and slept. This he could narrate, and would be most apt to relate, to his own offspring; for no information is more gratefully tendered, nor more ardently received, than that which respects the beginning of things. Hence, we infer that nothing is more reasonable than that the origin of things would be the first and most important of all traditions; and so we do not find an ancient nation whose history has come down to us that has not some account of its own origin, and most of them some account of the origin of all things. But it is scarcely conceivable that the first pair, remembering and being conscious of the first time they saw the sun, could be ignorant of the author of their existence.

That man was, in his first estate, designed to converse familiarly with his creator, the scriptures teach us; and not until he became a transgressor was this familiarity interrupted. Man is inferior to all other animals in instinctive powers—and this truth goes far to convince us that he was not constituted to be governed by *instinct*, but by *reason*. His being now more imbecile and helpless in his infancy than other creatures, only corroborates the account of his fall; for had he been designed to be governed by instinct, he would have exhibited it in at least as much perfection as other animals. Hence it is that, until reason is developed, the infant man is worse calculated to provide for himself than any other creature.

None of the steps in this argument are long. The first man was an adult. When first he opened his eyes, his reason and his senses were both in meridian strength. He could not but be sensible of his Maker. He must always remember the first time he saw the sun, ate, drank, slept and awoke. He must have often reflected upon these first acts of his existence. He would delight to tell them, and his offspring would be most curious to hear them. Traditionary information upon these subjects is as natural as walking, talking, eating, or the most ordinary acts of any animal. Man is, therefore, so created and circumstanced now as to be naturally and necessarily *credulous*. *Credulity*—for I know no term more expressive of the native bias to receive truth upon testimony—I say, credulity is as natural to man as breathing. This is a wise provision in the constitution of the human mind, that it must, and, with the utmost ease, does assent to testimony; for, without it, there could be no improvability in man. He would cease to be a progressive being. No child could be educated without it. Without it, the art of the linguist, the logician, the rhetorician would be unavailing. Human nature would be a *metal* (if I may be allowed the figure) that would not polish. But it is a law of human nature, as self-evident and as interesting as any one of Mr. Owen's code, and much more worthy of being called a "law of human nature" than any one of the twelve, that it is natural to man to be assured of truth, or to believe upon testimony. This, more than any one of his twelve laws, distinguishes and elevates man above the brutes. If I did not think it

more worthy of being one of the first, I would adopt the lofty style of my opponent, and call it the *thirteenth* fundamental law of human nature. Being first infants, and dependent on our parents and seniors for information, we are, from a necessity of nature, susceptible of progressive improvement—but almost exclusively through faith.

Mr. Owen himself walks by faith in human testimony. And although he may not be conscious of it, he has believed as firmly, and acted as *implicitly*, as any christian was ever required to do. While in Scotland, he heard that there was one quarter of the world called America, and he heard a great many reports concerning it. Now, although there are many falsehoods told, and many impositions practiced, and thereby faith rendered more precarious and fallible, yet Mr. Owen was able to discriminate the truth, and to rely upon the credible evidence which was presented to him. He had no experience of the climate, soil, products, government, and all the circumstances of the country. But so strong was his faith in testimony, and even on that sort of testimony which is often fallacious, that he is moved by his faith to leave his country, friends, relatives, and acquaintance, and trust his person and property upon the mighty ocean—encounter all the dangers of the sea, and deny himself of many comforts for the time being, in quest of that in which he believed. This is as much faith as ever was required of a christian to translate him out of the kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of God's own Son. As much faith, as much self-denial, as much perseverance, would have led Mr. Owen into a kingdom and country incomparably more desirable than Eden was, in all its virgin beauties, in all its primitive excellence, had that faith reposed upon truth supernatural—truth as certain, and better documented, than was the testimony of those upon whose credibility Mr. Owen started from Lanark for New Harmony.

Before I sit down, may I ask my opponent, for the sake of his own reputation as a logician, and a challenger of the world, to pay some attention to these arguments and topics; that the public may not read them without the form of a reply, or the semblance of a refutation.

MR. OWEN'S NINTH ADDRESS.

I shall now proceed, my friends, to another view of this subject in order to prove all these facts in another direction — to show that there is no kind of inconsistency or contradiction between one part of the system and another. In the development of one entire new state of things, it will appear that my arguments will apply with still greater force and minuteness.

[*Here Mr. Owen commences reading "an attempt to develop the outlines of an entire new state of existence, founded solely on the divine laws of human nature."*]

All past and present societies of men have been founded in direct opposition to these divine laws, and, in consequence, virtue has

generally been made to consist in acting *contrary* to them, and vice in being *obedient* to them.

We now propose for universal adoption, another state of society, in which virtue shall consist in being *obedient* to these laws, and vice in *opposing* them.

These divine laws are:

1. That man, at his birth, has been made ignorant of everything relative to his own organization, and he has not been permitted to create any part of the propensities, faculties, and qualities, physical or mental, which have been given to him, or which he possesses.

2. That no two infants have yet been known to possess precisely the same organization at birth, and the differences between all infants are formed by a power unknown to them.

3. That each individual is placed, at birth, without his consent or knowledge, within circumstances, which, acting upon his peculiar organization, impress the general character of those circumstances upon the infant, child, and man; the influence of those circumstances being modified, in some degree, by the peculiar natural organization of each individual.

4. That no individual has had the power of deciding at what period of time, or in what part of the world, he shall come into existence; of whom he shall be born; what district religion he shall be trained to believe, or by what other circumstances he shall be surrounded from birth to death.

5. That each individual is so organized, that, when young, he may be made to receive impressions from those around him, which shall produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and to retain them with great tenacity.

6. That each individual is so organized, that he must believe according to the strongest impressions that shall be made on his feelings; while his belief in no case depends upon his will.

7. That each individual is so created, that he must like that which is pleasant to him, or that which produces agreeable sensations on his individual organization; and he must dislike that which creates in him unpleasant or disagreeable sensations; while he cannot discover, previous to experience, what these sensations shall be.

8. That each individual is so created, that the sensations made upon his organization, although pleasant or delightful at their commencement, become, when continued without intermission beyond a certain period, disagreeable and painful; while, on the contrary, when a too rapid change of sensations is made on his organization, it dissipates, weakens, and otherwise injures his physical, intellectual, and moral powers and enjoyments.

9. That the highest health, the greatest progressive improvement, and most permanent happiness of each individual depend, in a great degree, upon the proper cultivation of all his faculties, physical and mental, from infancy to maturity, and upon all these parts of his nature being duly called into action, at their proper period, and

temperately exercised according to the strength and capacity of the individual.

10. That the individual is made to possess and acquire the *worst* character, when his organization at birth has been composed of the most inferior ingredients, or natural qualities of our common nature, and, when he has been so organized, that he has been placed from birth to death amidst the most *vicious* or *worst* circumstances.

11. That the individual is made to possess and acquire a *medium* character, when his original organization has been created *superior*, but the circumstances which surround him from birth to death produce continued *unfavorable* impressions. Or when his organization has been formed of *inferior* propensities, faculties, and qualities, and the circumstances in which he has been placed from birth to death are of a character to produce *superior* impressions only. Or when there has been some mixture of *superior* and *inferior* qualities in the original organization, when it has been placed through life in various circumstances of good and evil. Hitherto this has been the common lot of mankind.

12. That the individual is made the most superior of his species when his original organization has been compounded of the best proportions, of the best ingredients of which human nature is formed, and when the circumstances which surround him during life produce only superior impressions. In other words, when his organization is the most perfect, and the laws, institutions, and practices which surround him are all in unison with his nature.

These twelve fundamental laws will be found, on examination, to be in strict accordance with all existing facts; and in a rational state of society, all the laws and institutions will be founded upon them and they will govern the actions of all men.

These laws, in the aggregate, demonstrate that man does not form his own physical, intellectual, or moral nature; that, consequently, he can have no merit or demerit for his particular organization in his person, and that all pride or assumed distinction, arising from the possession of them, under the most favored combinations in which they may exist, are irrational feelings arising solely from ignorance.

These laws also demonstrate that man is compelled to *believe* according to the strongest conviction that can be made upon his mind, and to *feel* according to the most powerful impressions of pain or pleasure which can be made upon his organization. Consequently that he is a being irresponsible for his thoughts and feelings—irresponsible, whether he has been compelled by the circumstances around him, to believe in accordance with facts, or in opposition to them, or, whether he has been formed to love what others hate, or dislike what others approve. All institutions, therefore, formed in opposition to these divine laws of human nature must be irrational. *All the institutions of men have been formed in opposition to them.*

These laws also demonstrate that man is a twofold being, whose

character and conduct are formed, in part, by the peculiar organization which he possesses at birth, and in part, by the impressions which influence that organization through life.

That the organization of each individual at birth, and the circumstances which influence it afterward, although generally similar, are in many particulars dissimilar; yet that the difference, whatever may be the extent, does not proceed from the will of the individuals. Consequently all uncharitableness, all anger and irritation, and all pride, for possessing particular feelings, proceed solely from ignorance of the divine laws of human nature, and are therefore irrational.

Again, these laws demonstrate that the character and conduct of every human being, are essentially formed by the external circumstances which are allowed to exist around them from birth to death, although their character and conduct are in some degree modified by the particular organization given to each individual at birth.

Consequently no man can be justly made responsible for what he is, or for anything he may say or do; he cannot possess merit or demerit for his thoughts or feelings, for he is a being wholly formed by circumstances, all of which, when traced to their source, are, in reality, beyond his control.

He is a being, however, who is evidently organized to desire happiness above all things, and that desire, united with a knowledge of the divine laws of human nature, will form a new train of circumstances, which will enable the men of one generation to adopt practical measures to insure the happiness of their successors.

For these divine laws direct the certain way to happiness, "such as it has not yet entered into the heart of man to conceive." For a knowledge of these laws will create the inclination and power to live in obedience to them, and "perfect obedience" will produce the highest happiness that man can enjoy.

RELIGION.

In this new state of existence, all that is contrary to these divine laws of human nature, in all the religions in the world, will be withdrawn, and then true religion, or *truth*, pure, and undefiled, without useless and senseless rites, forms, or ceremonies, will alone remain. For many of these rites and ceremonies in all countries, are in direct opposition to the divine laws of human nature.

Some of these rites and ceremonies are weak and childish, others are absurd and cruel, and some are horrid and monstrous. These errors were engendered in the imaginations of men, when they "knew not what manner of beings they were;" when they were "babes and sucklings" in real knowledge; when "they did those things which they ought not to have done for their happiness."

The time is now near at hand, when these worse than childish proceedings must give place to the plain and simple "law of obedience," to one uniform practice in accordance to the divine will or to the divine laws of human nature, and thus shall the "knowledge of

the Lord" or of divine truth "cover the earth as the waters cover the seas," and therefore mythology, fables, dogmas, forms, and mysteries, founded in ignorance of these divine laws, will soon be banished from the earth. Then men will no longer look through these for better things as "through a glass darkly," but they will know themselves, and all motive to deception of every kind being removed "they will know each other even as they are known." And when these false dogmas, fables, and mysteries, and the fundamental errors from which they spring, shall be removed from society, and when they shall be replaced by a knowledge of the simple and beautiful divine laws of human nature, then, and not till then, "shall the mind be born again." And when this change shall take place there shall be no perplexity or confusion of ideas; but, on the contrary, the feelings, thoughts, language, and conduct of all men shall be consistent, and they will always harmonize together.

What is the amount of man's knowledge, at this day, of those subjects which he has been trained to call divine?

He knows, through the medium of his senses, that the universe exists, and that those parts of it which he can perceive and understand, appear to him to be in constant motion. That decompositions, of the materials of the universe, continually take place, and new compositions with or without life, are again formed. That these compositions, decompositions, and recompositions, in endless succession, proceed from a power to him unknown and therefore mysterious. And of those things which man has called divine, this is the whole amount of the knowledge which he has yet acquired. He may, perhaps, learn more when he shall be taught to "know himself" and obey the laws of his nature, by investigating fact after fact, to the extent that the faculties with which he has been furnished will permit.

At all events, he will be thus trained to acquire a manly and cheerful confidence in the unknown power that everywhere surrounds him, and in which he lives, moves, and has his being.

But he will discover no motive to be afraid of its extent, or to distrust its ultimate results, and much less to flatter it by ceremonies and forms which are degrading to created beings.

Instead of errors like these being made to engage the attention of our offspring, let us henceforward direct them to contemplate the beautiful expanse around us; to observe the mighty movements within it; to study those unchanging laws by which the germs of organization exist upon the earth, and become gradually perfected, each according to its kind, and again slowly or more rapidly declining, until they are redissolved into the original elements of the universe; commencing again their ceaseless round of new compositions; then let them be taught to reflect how all these movements and laws harmonize together. They will be delighted with the knowledge they will thus acquire; and the more they know, the more they will desire to act in obedience to these divine laws.

Let us, therefore, now remove far away from succeeding generations all these useless and degrading abominations, which serve only to debase the great mass of mankind, and to lay their intellectual faculties prostrate before a few of their fellows, who, in no respect, are made superior to themselves, except by a peculiar education. And a much better education than any of them have yet received may now be given to every individual of the human race.

But with the knowledge now acquired of these divine laws, we cannot be angry or displeased with any of them, even with those who have been thus trained to be the most irrational and cruel—no, not to those who have tortured their fellows, or sacrificed them on the altar of their gods.

Do any of these yet remain on the earth, we must pity them, have charity for them; speak kindly to them, and endeavor by all the means in our power to do them good.

ARTIFICIAL LAWS.

All human laws, as they now exist, are, as we have stated, in opposition to the divine laws of human nature; they presuppose that man has been so organized as to possess the power to compel himself to think as he pleases, and to feel as he likes. All human governments are founded on these notions, and they must lead men altogether astray from truth and happiness. They are, therefore, not only useless, but highly injurious in every light in which they can be viewed.

Written laws of human invention are necessary only while attempts shall be made to govern men in opposition to their nature and contrary to reason.

All the artificial laws and institutions of man's devising, in opposition to his nature, have ever been a curse to the human race, and they may be safely superseded as soon as the rising generation shall become familiar with the laws of their nature, and shall be placed within circumstances in which they may act in obedience to them.

When this shall be done, all motive to disunion, or to create any unpleasant difference of opinion or feeling, will cease, and whatever may require adjustment between individuals or communities, will be speedily and satisfactorily arranged by the persons appointed to govern the interests of all equally.

PRIVATE PROPERTY.

In this new state of existence all private property in persons and things, that is in opposition to the fixed laws of human nature, will cease, and, in consequence, selfishness, poverty, and jealousy will terminate.

Instead of submitting to the innumerable evils arising from private property, arrangements will be formed to secure, for every one, from birth to death, a full supply of everything that is the best for human nature, taking also into consideration the minor differences formed by nature, in the organization of each individual.

As soon as all unnecessary private property shall be abolished, it will no longer be, or appear to be, for the interest of any one, that anything inferior in quality shall be produced for the use of man.

There will be no inferior cultivation; no inferior houses or buildings of any kind; no inferior roads, bridges, canals, aqueducts, vessels for navigation, or machinery for any purpose; all of them will be constructed of the best materials that can be procured, and they will be planned and executed under the direction of those who shall be found to possess the best knowledge and the most valuable experience upon each subject respectively. In short, whatever is to be done will be executed in the neatest manner known at the time, in any part of society; for the talents of each will be applied the most advantageously for the benefit of all.

WAR.

In this new state of existence wars will terminate as rapidly as a knowledge of the laws of human nature shall be made to extend over the earth.

For war is opposed to the happiness of the human race. It is beneficial for all that there should be a full supply of the best of everything for every human being, and that all should be more or less engaged in its production, preservation, or distribution.

But war withdraws the efficient part of the population from producing, preserving, or distributing, and forms it into a most effective power to consume wastefully, to destroy upon a large scale, and to prevent production.

It is the interest of all men, without any exception, that all their powers should be applied to aid in producing the best of everything for every one, or to be employed in some way that shall promote the greatest benefit.

In the present irrational state of existence, it is often, among the wealthy indeed, generally deemed more honorable to be employed in occupations useless or injurious, rather than to be seen making or producing anything useful or necessary for the existence or enjoyment of rational beings.

This war, through all its ramifications, is destructive of happiness, and of the rational faculties of the human race, and yet it has been deemed the most honorable of all employments.

For those men who have been the most successful in destroying the productions of their fellow men; in killing and wounding the greatest number of them; in burning their habitations and property; in creating thereby the greatest extent of famine, and the largest amount of individual suffering and misery with the most wide-spread destruction of human industry and comfort, have been through all past ages the most honored and rewarded.

In the new state of existence, all these proceedings will be deemed irrational, and will never be practiced except by those who are insane.

As soon, therefore, as a generation shall be trained from infancy in a knowledge of the divine laws of human nature, all contention will cease, and charity and peace will everywhere prevail.

MR. CAMPBELL'S NINTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—It is surely a novel species of logic to argue, that, because we shall have better houses, and better schools, and must have new bridges, etc., therefore the christian religion must be false. To resume the subject of materialism, which is the system of my friend, Mr. Owen, it will be necessary to observe, that all the artificial mysteries of atheism have not emanated from the same brain, but from different intellects. In order to make out a system contrary to all *experience* and *history*, some materialists have been constrained to suppose (finding themselves perplexed to account for man's origin, either on the hypothesis of his coming into existence as an adult or an infant), that man was originally a being very different from what he now is. But whether he has degenerated, or improved, they do not testify. They also suppose another absurdity—viz: that there must have been an oak before an acorn; or, in other words, that vegetables must have existed before their seeds. This would be no absurdity, if we admit a Creator who produced by one almighty fiat, every vegetable in full vigor. But on any other hypothesis, it is an absurdity. This necessarily follows from their own premises. They also suppose that matter and motion originally possessed powers which they do not now. That because matter and motion cannot now produce new *genera* and *species*, therefore they have not all the powers they once had. This is first to assume a fact, and then to invent, or bribe, or suborn the testimony to prove it. That once they had the power of detaching themselves from other parts of the universe, and forming themselves into organized bodies, but that now they have grown old and feeble, and lost their power.

When they asserted that the material universe had no relation to an intelligent *First Cause*, but was the production of blind chance, or nature operating according to the laws of matter and motion, they were impelled to the above conclusion. Inasmuch as they do not find nature competent to the production of a new species or genus of vegetable or animal matter, they endeavor to excuse their system by asserting that she once possessed powers which she does not now possess. But this monstrous assumption must be taken for fact to account for anything on their premises. Yet these persons tell us they cannot believe a miracle because it is contrary to all experience!! But they can believe their own mysteries contrary to all the *experience* and information of mankind!—

> "Deny God—all is mystery beside;
> Millions of mysteries! each darker far
> Than that thy wisdom would unwisely shun.
> If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?
> We nothing know but what is marvelous;
> Yet what is marvelous we can't believe!"

But the system is liable to another exception. It can give no account of the manner in which the idea of a God became so universally prevalent, while they admit that the idea did obtain universality. I recollect I once pressed this difficulty upon the infidel editors of the New Harmony Gazette.

[*Here Mr. Campbell reads from the "Christian Baptist" a problem addressed to the editors of the "New Harmony Gazette."*]

"A PROBLEM

"To the Editors of the New Harmony Gazette.

"*You think that reason cannot originate the idea of an Eternal First Cause, or that no man could acquire such an idea by the employment of his senses and reason — and you think correctly. You think also that the Bible is not a supernatural revelation—not a revelation from a Deity in any sense. These things premised, gentlemen, I present my problem in the form of a query again.*"

"*The christian idea of an Eternal First Cause uncaused, or of a God, is now in the world, and has been for ages immemorial. You say it* could not *enter into the world by* reason, *and it* did not *enter by* revelation. *Now, as you are philosophers and historians, and have all the means of knowing,* How did it come into the world?"

[Mr. Owen asserts, after hearing this problem read, "*By imagination.*"]

I am just now told by Mr. Owen, that the idea of a God obtained this universality through imagination. Now, let us try the merits of this solution. Imagination, all writers agree, has not the power of creating any new idea. It has the power of analyzing, combining, compounding, and new-modifying all the different ideas presented to it; but imagination has no creative power.

No system of philosophy that is now taught in any school, will warrant us to attribute to *imagination* any such power. Neither Locke nor Hume will allow it: and these are the most respectable in the christian and infidel schools. We shall hear what each of them has to say upon the power of imagination:—

"Although nothing is so unbounded in its operations as the powers of the mind, and the imagination of man—to form monsters, and join incongruous shapes, and appearances, costs the imagination no more trouble, than to conceive of the most natural and familiar objects; and while the body is confined to one planet, along which it creeps with pain and difficulty, the imagination and thought can transport us in an instant into the most distant regions of the universe. But although our thought seems to possess this unbounded liberty, we shall find, upon a nearer examination, that it is really confined within very narrow limits, and that *all this creative power of the mind amounts to nothing more than the faculty of combining transposing, augmenting, and diminishing the materials afforded us by sense and experience.*"—HUME.

"The simple ideas are the materials of all our knowledge, which

are suggested and furnished to the mind only by sensation and reflection. When the understanding is once stored with these simple ideas, it has the power to repeat, compare, and unite them, even to an almost infinite variety, and so can make, at pleasure, new complex ideas. But it is not in the power of the most exalted wit, or enlarged understanding, by any quickness or variety of thoughts, to invent or frame one new simple idea in the mind, not taken in by the ways before mentioned ; nor can any force of the understanding destroy those that are there."—"The dominion of man in this little world of his understanding, being much the same as it is in the great world of visible things ; wherein his power, however managed by art and skill, reaches no further than to compound and divide, or decompose the materials that are made to his hand, but can do nothing toward making the least particle of new matter, or destroying an atom of what is already in being. The same inability will every one find in himself who should go about to fashion in his understanding any simple idea not received by his senses from external objects, or by reflection from the operations of his own mind about them. I would have any one try to fancy any taste, which had never affected his palate ; or frame the idea of a scent he had never felt ; and when he can do this, I will also conclude that a deaf man has distinct notions of sounds."—"It is *impossible* for any one to imagine any other qualities in bodies, however constituted, whereby they can be taken notice of beside sounds, tastes, smells, visible, and tangible qualities. Had mankind been made with but four senses, the qualities, then, which are the objects of the fifth sense, had been as far from our notice, imagination, and conception, as now any belonging to the sixth, a seventh, or an eighth sense, can possibly be ; which, whether yet some other creatures in some other parts of this 'vast and stupendous universe, may not have, will be a great presumption to deny.'"—*Locke.* Such is Mr. Hume's doctrine, and it agrees with Mr. Locke's and other philosophers'. Now, if this be true, and founded on a strict analysis of the human mind, and predicated of universal experience — how could man have imagined a God ? Let us try the faculty of imagination, and prove, by our own experience, its *creative power.* We have but *five* senses ; I would therefore ask Mr. Owen, and every one present, if you can, by any exertion of your faculties, imagine a *sixth* sense ? What would it be ? If you were to imagine any other sense, it must be analogous to those you already possess. You might imagine a being like the fabulous Argus, with a hundred eyes ; but fancy that you possessed an organ, like that of Fame, that would enable you to hear from a greater distance than the eye could reach to ; but could you have imagined this unless you had derived the simple idea of hearing from your organ of hearing. But a sixth sense, unlike those possessed, cannot be imagined. Now, if Mr. Owen cannot, from his five senses, imagine a sixth, how can he assert that

a savage or philosopher could imagine a God? But I call upon Mr. Owen to imagine and report to us a sixth sense.

In the system of causation, natural religionists go upon the ladder of effect and cause, up to the first cause; but to reason *à posteriori* on this subject, is, in my opinion, fallacious. It is predicated of a *petitio principii*, inasmuch as it assumes that the material universe is an *effect*. *Quod erat demonstrandum*—the very thing to be proved. I do hope that this debate will put the question between Deists and Christians to repose. Deism is all founded on a *petitio principii*,—a begging of the question to be proved. Atheism or Christianity must obtain the dominion over every inquisitive mind. When I hear a Deist talking about "the light of nature" and "the great God of nature," I am reminded of the school-boy, who stole a penknife; and when charged with the fact, said, he found it growing upon an apple-tree. This was equivalent to a confession of the theft, since we all know penknives do not grow upon apple-trees. In like manner the reasonings of the Deists, upon their own premises, show that their conclusions do not logically follow. You might as well look for penknives growing upon apple-trees as for Lord Herbert's doctrine in the mind of a savage. There is no stopping-place between Atheism and Christianity.

As we have, perhaps, sufficiently gone into the detail in demonstrating, from the mysteries of Atheism, that the materialist acts upon the very principle which he condemns in christians; that is, in believing what he cannot comprehend, and contrary to his own experience; and not only this, but in giving to imagination a power which it does not possess, and afterward acting according to the mere vagaries of fancy, more than the most enthusiastic christians; I say, having shown that the materialists assent to and teach mysteries which they cannot ever explain; believe and reason contrary to universal experience, and follow imagination, while they ascribe these as foibles to others; I will finish my readings and comments upon this system, by giving the moral consummation from one of their ablest writers.

You have heard a great deal about necessity. All Mr. Owen's facts have been adduced to prove that we are locked up in the chains of an inexorable fatality. That you may see the moral tendency of this doctrine, I shall read you a few sentences from Mirabaud's System of Nature:

"Life being commonly for man the greatest of all benefits, it is to be presumed that he who deprives himself of it is impelled by an invincible force. It is the excess of misery, despair, derangement of the machine, caused by melancholy, which carries man on to destroy himself. Agitated, then, by contrary impulses, he is, as we have before said, obliged to follow a middle course that conducts him to his death. If man is not free in any one instance of his life, he is again much less so in the act by which it is terminated.

"We see, then, that he who kills himself does not commit, as they pretend, an outrage on nature, or, if they will, on its author. He follows an impulse of nature, in taking the only means that she leaves him to quit his pains; he goes out of existence by a door that she leaves open to him; he cannot offend her in accomplishing the law of necessity; the iron hand of which having broken the spring that rendered life desirable to him, and urged him to conserve himself, shows that he ought to quit a rank or system which he finds too bad to be willing to remain in. His country, or his family, have no right to complain of a member that it cannot render happy, and from whom it has nothing more to hope for itself. To be useful to his country, or to his family, it is necessary that man should cherish his own peculiar existence, that he has an interest in conserving himself, loves the bonds which unite him to others, and is capable of occupying himself with their felicity. In short, that the suicide should be punished in the other life, and repent of his precipitate steps, it were needful that he should outlive himself, and that, in consequence, he should carry with him, into his future residence, his organs, his senses, his memory, his ideas, and his actual mode of existing and of thinking.

"In short, nothing is more useful than to inspire men with a contempt for death, and to banish from their minds the false ideas which are given them of its consequences. The fear of death will never make anything but cowards; the fear of its pretended consequences will make nothing but fanatics, or pious, melancholy beings, useless to themselves and to others. Death is a resource that we must not, by any means, take away from oppressed virtue, which the injustice of men frequently reduces to despair. If men feared death less, they would neither be slaves nor superstitious. Truth would find defenders more zealous; the rights of man would be more hardily sustained; error would be more powerfully combated, and tyranny would be forever banished from nations. Cowardice nourishes it, and fear perpetuates it. In short, men can neither be contented nor happy while their opinions shall oblige them to TREMBLE!"

Such, my friends, is the *necessary* consequence of the *doctrine of necessity*. I propose to-morrow, all things concurring, to present you systematically with the argument already introduced demonstrative of the last position; and, after that, to adduce the direct and positive evidences of the truth and certainty of the christian religion.

MR. OWEN'S TENTH ADDRESS.

My friends, the subject in which we finished reading yesterday evening was *war*. The next subject is one of great interest to all of us. It is *marriage*.

MARRIAGE.

As we have seen that man is so organized by nature, that he must like that which is agreeable to him, and dislike that which nature has made disagreeable, all engagements between men and women,

professing to like or love each other, through future unknown changes in both, will altogether terminate. Other and much better arrangements will be formed for their union, agreeable to the divine laws of their nature, and which will put an end to the present prostitution of both body and mind, to jealousy, and to all sexual crimes. The invention of unnatural marriages has been the sole origin of all sexual crimes. They have rendered prostitution unavoidable. They have erected a spurious chastity, and destroyed all knowledge of pure chastity. For real chastity consists in connection with affection, and prostitution in connection without affection.

The artificial bonds of indissoluble marriage, and the single family arrangements to which marriage leads, are much more calculated to *destroy* than to *promote* affection, and, in consequence, the parties frequently live together in a state of real prostitution, both of body and mind, and by the customs, established in various countries, they are obliged to be satisfied with this *spurious* chastity, which is *real* prostitution.

In the new state of existence, that which experience has proved to be really beneficial in marriage or single family arrangements, will be retained, while all that is injurious and contrary to nature, will be dismissed.

By these arrangements, men and women will be equally well educated, they will have the same rights and privileges, and they will associate on terms of intimacy through their lives, with those only for whom they cannot avoid feeling the most regard and greatest affection.

COMMERCE,

Now consists in buying and selling for a monied profit, and necessarily engenders every kind of deception and injustice under the specious term of fair trading. This kind of traffic will not be known in our new state of existence. The fewest in number, and those especially appointed for the purpose, will make such exchange of commodities, between the different associations as experience shall prove to be the best for all, and every commodity will be exchanged in cases, for the same amount of labor which it contains according to general estimates, accurately made, and applicable alike to all parties. Those who convey the articles from one place to another and make the exchange will have their labor added to the previous estimate of labor in them.

The equitable exchange of surplus productions, upon this system, will be much better effected than they are now, by less than one per cent. of the present cost to the producers, all of which is deducted from the real value of their labor; and all the degradation and immorality of bargaining will be withdrawn from society.

TRAVELING

Will be arranged, in the new state of existence, to give every advantage which can arise from it, while almost all its real inconve-

niences will be greatly diminished. And all who desire will have the privilege of removing from one association, and from one district to another, under such regulations as will be for the benefit of all the members of the communities.

The accommodations for traveling by land or water, will be the best that can be devised for health and comfort, and for promoting the means of improvements. These objects, by foresight under a proper system may be obtained without difficulty.

EDUCATION.

All the advantages which old society has endeavored to gain from governments, religions, laws, wars, marriages, and commerce; in all of which it has grievously failed, will be attained and secured, in the new state of existence, by an entire change of the circumstances by which the whole character of man will be formed by education from infancy to maturity.

He will be trained and educated from birth within circumstances all in unison with the known laws of his nature; he will be early taught to discover and understand them by the exercise of his intellectual faculties and to act in obedience to them by a conviction, that they alone, can lead to happiness, and by observing the advantages derived from obeying these laws by those of mature age and experience.

All will thus acquire an accurate knowledge of the science of the influence of circumstances over human nature and know how to act upon that knowledge in all the business of life. They will speedily learn to know what is essential to the well-being, the well-doing and the happiness of society. They will soon discover that the great business of life will consist in educating, producing, preserving, distributing, and preparing the means for enjoying. And to do these, in the best manner, for the young, middle aged, and old, the three classes into which society will be divided will occupy the attention of every one, and be a constant source of exercise, interest, and pleasure to all.

The sacrifice to which men of the present generation must submit, before they can secure the benefit of this new state of existence, is, that they must enjoy their happiness upon principles of perfect equality with all of the human race.

For these enjoyments cannot be obtained under any system of artificial inequality or separation into distinct classes. The new state of existence will admit of those differences only which nature makes unavoidable, that is, age and knowledge.

This new mode of education will call into full action the physical, intellectual, and moral powers of all individuals, and will form them to be, in consequence, much more competent to the whole business of life than their predecessors in old society.

GOVERNMENTS.

Artificial governments will be required only so long as men shall be retained in ignorance of the divine laws of their nature, and trained

to be vicious. A preliminary government will be therefore necessary, while the change is progressing from the old to the new state.

After the change shall have been effected, by the education of an entire generation in the knowledge and practice of the divine laws, a natural government will be formed in unison with them.

It is now evident, that no people can be virtuous, intelligent and happy under any despotic or elective government, or under any modification of them. They must necessarily produce evil continually.

Monarchy is defective in principle, on account of the uncertain character of the sovereign, as well as the extreme inequality it produces in the condition of the governed.

The elective principle is equally defective, under the old arrangement of society, on account of the corruption of morals, and the unceasing bad feelings which it engenders.

And any combination of these two modes of government will necessarily partake of the evils of both. But no government, even the best ever known in old society, can do more than mitigate, for a short period, some of the innumerable evils which an opposition to the laws of nature unavoidably produces.

The existing generation however is not prepared for a government in accordance with all the laws of nature; we have been so much injured by the erroneous impressions which have been made on our minds, and by the vicious character which has been formed for us, that the utmost that can be expected in our case is an approximation in some degree toward that which is right in principle and correct in practice.

A preliminary government must, therefore, be framed for the present generation, to lead it onward gradually, as the mind expands, and the practice improves, until our children shall be fully prepared for one in accordance with all the divine laws of human nature.

And this preliminary government must be made to approximate more or less to the laws of nature, as the parties preparing to act upon the social system shall have acquired more or less knowledge of it.

In this preliminary government, therefore, there must be a modification of the existing laws and customs relative to religion, marriage, private property, responsibility, or rewards, or punishments, and of the modes of producing, distributing, and enjoying, as well as of educating those who have been already partially instructed in the false notions and injurious practices of the present systems.

The extent to which these approximations shall proceed toward the perfect laws of nature, must be left to the decision of the united will of the parties, who associate, to commence the social or natural system; or to the, perhaps, more calm determination of the person whom they may appoint to administer the new government, until they shall become sufficiently experienced to govern themselves according to the laws of their nature.

It is probable these modifications will be at first, various, depending, in some degree, upon the climate, soil, and previous habits and customs, but most essentially, upon the progress the whole party uniting may have acquired of the laws of their nature.

It will be readily conceived that in the new state of existence slavery will be unknown. It will, of course, die a natural death under the preliminary government of the present generation, and in the second generation, servitude also will cease.

After that period all the domestic operations of the world will be performed by mechanical inventions and chemical discoveries, under the direction of the youth of both sexes, a knowledge of which they will acquire theoretically and practically, as a necessary and important part of their education, and in this respect all will pass through the same training and exercise. It is probable that this part of the business of life will be easily completed, in a manner greatly superior to anything hitherto known, before these young persons shall be twenty years of age, perhaps at eighteen, and the arrangements may be so formed as to make that which is now considered a task of slavery by the most ignorant, to become a delightful occupation; in fact, a pleasure and a pastime to the most intelligent in principle, and the most expert in practice.

In this new state of existence, physical and intellectual employments will be held in estimation in proportion as they are necessary and useful; and all useless occupations, as long as there shall be anything useful to perform, or new knowledge to acquire, will be deemed a waste of time and faculties, to be practiced only by the irrational or insane.

Idleness, the bane of human happiness, will be unknown; it will be wholly prevented by the new mode of education as it will be applied in infancy, childhood, and youth; while, on the contrary, over-exertion of body and mind, will not be practiced, because all will know that temperance in the exercise and use of all our faculties will give the greatest amount of happiness that human nature can enjoy.

OF A NATURAL GOVERNMENT, OR OF ONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAWS OF NATURE.

A government founded on these principles will attend solely to the improvement and happiness of the governed.

Its first inquiries will be to ascertain what human nature is, what are the laws of its organization and of its existence from birth to death.

The second, What is necessary for the happiness of a being so formed and matured.

And the third, What are the best means by which to attain these requisites, and to secure them permanently for all the governed.

We have developed the divine laws of human nature in sufficient detail for the present purpose.

Those things which are necessary for the happiness of a being so formed and matured, are comprised, perhaps, in the following enumeration.

OF THINGS NECESSARY FOR HUMAN HAPPINESS.

1. The possession of a good organization, physical, mental, and moral.

2. Having the power to procure, at pleasure, whatever is necessary to keep that organization in the best state of health.

3. An education which shall cultivate, in the best manner, from infancy to maturity, the physical, intellectual, and moral powers of all the population.

4. The means and inclination to promote the happiness of our fellow-beings.

5. The means and inclination to increase continually our stock of knowledge.

6. The means of enjoying the best society we know, and more particularly, the power of associating at pleasure with those for whom we cannot avoid feeling the most regard and greatest affection.

7. The means of traveling at pleasure.

8. A release from superstition, from supernatural fears, and from the fear of death.

And lastly, to live in a society in which all its laws, institutions, and arrangements, shall be in accordance with the divine laws of human nature, well organized, and well governed. A more detailed examination of these nine general conditions will be found in the appendix.

The third great object of a natural government will be to devise and execute the arrangements, by which these conditions shall be obtained for, and secured to, all the governed.

Its laws will be few, easily to be understood by all the governed, and in every instance in unison with the laws of human nature, They may be perhaps contained in the following

CODE OF NATURAL LAWS.

1. As all men have equal rights by nature, all will have equal rights in the new state of existence; and, therefore, all men shall be upon a perfect equality from birth to death in their conditions of life.

2. As all men are composed of their own peculiar organization *at* birth, and of the influence which the circumstances around them from birth made upon that particular organization, and as no man creates his own organization, or the circumstances which surround him, in infancy, childhood, and youth, or at any subsequent period of life, except in so far as he is influenced thereto by the impressions previously made on his organization by those early circumstances, therefore, no man shall be held responsible for his physical compo-

sition, for his intellectual faculties, or for his moral feelings, and consequently for his character and conduct.

As the society however in which he shall be born and shall live, will derive all the benefit of his good actions, and experience all the inconveniences of his bad qualities, and as the society will have in a very great degree the formation of the character and direction of the conduct of all individuals, under its education and government; it will be alone entitled to all the praise or blame which the actions of the individual may deserve. Beings formed as man is, cannot justly be entitled to individual reward or punishment in this life or the next.

2. As no individual can believe or disbelieve contrary to the strongest impressions made upon his mind, no merit or reward, no blame or punishment shall be awarded to any individual for any opinions, notions, or faith whatever.

4. As man is organized to receive impressions from external objects and internal reflections, according to the unchanging or divine laws of his nature, no man shall be made, in any degree, responsible for his sensations, whether of liking or disliking, loving, indifference, or hating, of pleasure or of pain, or of whatever character or description they may be.

But all shall be educated from infancy in perfect sincerity, that they may give a faithful expression of their sensations, in order that society may acquire the most accurate knowledge of human nature, and consequently of the means by which all may be the most improved and rendered the most happy.

5. Each individual shall have his physical, intellectual, and moral nature cultivated from infancy to maturity, in the best manner known to the society in which he shall be born and shall live.

6. Every individual shall pass from infancy through the same general routine of education and domestic teaching and employments, in order that the highest happiness may be permanently secured for society, and that every one of its members may have, with the least inconvenience, his full share of the best of everything for his individual nature.

7. The best only of everything shall be produced by society for all its members.

Because to do so will be the most perfect economy, consequently the best cultivation, the best buildings, the best dress, the best vessels, machinery, and manufactures, the best education, and the best amusements and recreation, known at the time, will be always provided for the use and enjoyment of every member of the society.

8. As loving and hating, liking, indifference, or disliking, depend not upon the will but upon the impressions which external objects compel each individual to receive by reason of his particular organization —

There shall be no artificial or unnatural bonds or engagements between the sexes, compelling them to commit perjury under the name

of marriage, by promising to love when they may be compelled to hate.

9. As pure chastity consists in cohabitation with mutual affection, and prostitution in connection without mutual affection, all children in the new state of existence will be naturally produced, according to the divine laws of human nature, and none will be produced unnaturally as at present without affection.

10. All children born in the new state of existence shall be from their birth, under the special care of the society to which they belong.

11. The children of all parents shall be trained and educated together, by the society, as the children of one family, and all of them shall be early taught the divine laws of their nature, in order that they may acquire a real affection for each other, and a pure charity, arising from a knowledge of the cause of every difference in person, mind, and feelings, which may exist among themselves, or between them and any of their fellow-beings.

12. All parents shall have free intercourse to and with their children, during the whole period of the formation of their character, which, a short experience will convince them, can never be well formed under any single family arrangement.

13. There shall be no unnecessary private property possessed by any one in this new state of existence. But each adult shall have the full use of two private apartments as long as the party to whom they shall be allotted by the society shall desire to retain them. They shall also retain all clothes and other things which they may receive from the society according to its rules, for their exclusive use and consumption.

14. As it is necessary for the attainment of all the conditions requisite to give happiness to mankind, that some certain number of individuals shall be associated as one family, to give the greatest amount of advantages with the fewest inconveniences, and as it is probable that experience will prove that number to be about one thousand individuals, composed of men, women, and children in the usual proportions; all the arrangements in the new state of existence shall be devised to admit the formation of associations and communities to consist of three hundred, as a minimum, and two thousand as a maximum, to form, instead of single families, the nucleus society, or the natural congregation of men in one place, the best calculated to promote each other's happiness.

15. That the aggregate of society, in this new state of existence, shall be composed of the union of these communities into such numbers or circles, as shall be found in practice, the most convenient for their general government.

It is probable, that very generally, they may be united into circles of tens for more local purposes, into hundreds, for smaller districts, into thousands, for larger districts, into millions, for the most extended purposes, until there shall be no artificial separation between any portion of mankind, to be an obstacle to prevent a union of lan-

guage, of interest and of feelings. Every obstacle to the union of mankind, being an evil.

16. Each of these communities, to secure their independence, shall possess around it, land sufficient for the full support of all its members, when they shall be at the maximum in number.

17. Each of these communities shall be arranged to give, as nearly as possible, the same advantages to all its members, and to afford easy communication with all other communities.

18. Each community shall be governed in all its general proceedings, by the council composed of all its members, between the ages of thirty-five and forty-five. And each department shall be under the immediate direction of a committee formed of the members of this council. And these members shall be chosen in the order to be determined upon by each council.

There will be, therefore, no selection or election of any individuals to office, after a period when all shall be trained to be more than equal to take his full share of the duties of management at the age fixed upon.

19. At thirty-five years of age, all who shall have been trained from infancy in the communities, shall be officially called upon to undertake their full share of the duties of management, and at forty-five they shall be excused from officially performing them.

20. The business of the council shall be to govern all the circumstances within the boundaries of its own community. To endeavor to improve them, by removing continually the most unfavorable circumstances to happiness, and by replacing them, by the best that can be devised among themselves, or, that they can obtain a knowledge of, from all the other communities.

21. The council shall have full power of government in all things as long as they do not act contrary to the divine laws of human nature. These laws shall be their guide upon all occasions, because, when understood, they will prevent one unjust or erroneous decision or proceeding.

22. If, however, which is deemed scarcely possible, this natural council of government shall ever attempt to contravene the laws of human nature, the elders of the community, who have passed the council, shall call a general meeting of all its members, above sixteen years of age, who have been trained from infancy within the communities. At this meeting, the conduct of the council, shall be calmly and patiently investigated, and if a majority of its members, shall afterward determine that the council has acted, or attempted to act, in opposition to the spirit of these divine laws; the government shall devolve upon the members of the community who have passed the council, and who are under fifty years of age, united with these members, who have not entered the council who shall be above thirty years of age.

23. All other differences of every description, if indeed it be possible for any to exist in such communities, shall be immediately

determined and amicably adjusted between the parties, by the decision of a majority of the three oldest members of the council. Except when the difference shall exist between members of the council, when it shall be in like manner decided by the three members, who have last passed through the council.

24. As soon as the members of these communities shall be educated from infancy in a knowledge of the divine laws of their nature, trained to act in obedience to them, and they shall be surrounded by circumstances all in unison with these laws, there shall be no individual punishment or reward.

All these educated, trained, and placed must, of necessity, at all times, think and act rationally, except they shall become, physically, intellectually, or morally diseased, and in this case the council shall direct to the best mode of cure, by removing them into the hospital for bodily or mental invalids until they shall be recovered by the mildest treatment that can effect their cure.

25. The council, whenever it shall be necessary, shall call to its aid the practical abilities of any of the members, under thirty-five years of age, and the advice of any of the members who shall have passed the council.

The individual Spartans were not the legitimate subjects of praise or blame, they were not, any more than any other people, the formers of their own character, but their characters were formed for them by the circumstances introduced by Lycurgus.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TENTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators—I am perfectly aware of the difficult circumstances in which my friend's course has placed you. You have been selected by Mr. Owen and myself for the express purpose of moderating this discussion, with the fullest confidence, on both our parts, in your ability and impartiality. To insure the most perfect impartiality, you were mutually selected. I am well aware, therefore, that you must feel yourselves responsible to us and to the community for your course in the management of this discussion. I have not the slightest reflection to make upon your mode of procedure—it is reasonable and consistent. You have entered your protest against Mr. Owen's course in this debate; for that, it has been irrelevant, impertinent, and out of the purview of the discussion contemplated; and to which the public have been invited. You also perceive my difficulties. I am here to reply to my friend's arguments in support of his own theses; the obvious scope of which was the subversion of all religion. I came here prepared to show that my opponent was not able to make good a single point which he had assumed; that he could not adduce a single logical proof in corroboration of his positions—therefore, I could not expect to have to open this discussion. This was not a supposable case. Had I known that I was to have taken the affirmative, I should have come forward prepared with some plan of argument in which my opponent might

have joined issue with me; and I would have led the discussion in such manner as would soon, in my opinion, have led us to rational conclusions. Surrounded with these difficulties, gentlemen, it appears necessary that some decision should be made on the course of investigation.

Yesterday I introduced a series of arguments, calculated, in my opinion, and in that of the public at large, to subvert Mr. Owen's propositions. He would not argue the merits of one of my positions. For two days Mr. Owen has been presenting a great variety of topics which we might have introduced as pertinently in any other discussion as the present. I have taken up his own positions in his own terms, and agreed to rest the merits of the controversy upon his own *allegata*. But as I stand pledged to subvert Mr. Owen's whole theory, I proposed yesterday to introduce a regular and connected argument, without paying any respect to anything which might be offered by him, unless it were pertinent to the subject-matter in debate. This morning we had a disquisition upon marriage, commerce, and a code of natural laws, none of which has any bearing upon, or logical connection with, the question at issue. I therefore ask you, gentlemen, to allow me to pursue what I deem the only correct course under present circumstances, and to declare your opinion of Mr. Owen's course in the management of his part of this discussion. Perhaps this will be equally necessary for your vindication as for my own, inasmuch as the whole proceedings may become matter of record. It was part of my original plan, that every morning a brief condensed view, or recapitulation, should be presented of the arguments and positions of the preceding day. On reviewing the outline of the course already pursued, I have made up the following abstract:

RECAPITULATION.

Mr. Owen's capital position, on which he has laid so much stress, is, that man, because he does not make himself or his circumstances, is an irresponsible being. In opposition to which we have urged this consideration—that, admitting its truth, it follows that infants, idiots, and madmen, philosophers, and the common sense part of the community, are all alike capable or incapable of society and moral government, because man has no more control over his own actions, than a mill-wheel has over its own revolutions. This was, as I conceive, reducing his argument to an absurdity.

His next capital position is, that all religious institutions and all civil governments are erroneous, because they are founded on human responsibility; they require man to have more control over his own actions than a mill-wheel has over its own revolutions. In opposition to both these positions, we have urged that man is constitutionally responsible, because *rational;* that all the circumstances which can surround any human being, the savage and the citizen, concur in suggesting to his mind in the very first dawnings of his

reason, his dependence and consequent responsibility. No human being can possibly be placed in any circumstances which do not impress upon his whole intellectual nature a sense of dependence and responsibility. Suppose a child born in a palace or a wigwam: in either case, the circumstances around him must, as soon as reason dawns, suggest to him a sense of dependence upon his protectors. This sense of dependence begets the idea of responsibility; and this principle of human nature is the foundation of all moral obligation, of every social compact, of all civil and political security.

A favorite corollary which Mr. Owen deduces from his views of necessity, or the fact that man did not create himself, nor his circumstances, is, that neither praise nor blame, merit nor demerit, can be ascribed to man. We have shown that also there can be no such thing as gratitude nor kind feeling, charity nor benevolence, due to any human being, more than to the fountain or rivulet which slakes our thirst, or to the tree which yields us its fruit. This I yesterday illustrated by showing that Mr. Owen's plan of cultivating the kind feelings would extirpate all feeling; and that, as to sympathies, we should stand toward each other like trees in the forest.

In preparing an amelioration of the condition of society, and consequently society itself, Mr. Owen asserts that the circumstances which now surround us, are of a vitiating, or of an *irrational* and antinatural character; on which we remark, that, as the circumstances which surround us are either *topical*, arising from our location, or *social*, the vitiocrity must be in the one or the other; not in the former, because it is natural; consequently it must be in our *social* circumstances. Now the question which he has not answered, and which we know he cannot answer, is, *How came the social circumstances to be irrational and antinatural, seeing necessity, or what he calls nature, has introduced them?*

The scriptures explain to us both the cause and character of these preternatural circumstances. Mr. Owen does not—cannot. The scriptures, too, adapt themselves to these preternatural circumstances, and bring men out of them. Mr. Owen's scheme is not adapted to them, neither can it educe man from these preternatural circumstances. Because founded upon an entire subversion of the laws of our nature, dependence, obligation, religion, individuality, matrimony, and the whole influence of natural relations, arising from these things; consequently unable to educe us from these preternatural circumstances.

Another rallying point to which Mr. Owen often resorts, is, that it is impossible for rational beings to be virtuously happy under a government which involves perpetual partial pain and misery. (The illustration of Mr. Owen was, that if he could believe one sentient being was suffering eternal torment, it would mar his peace of mind.) On this hypothesis, no man ever was, and no man ever can be happy; for the more virtuous, the more unhappy! That is, if virtuous happiness is to be made to depend upon our feeling ourselves existing

in such circumstances as to preclude all possible pain in any sentient being whatever; or if sympathy and virtue must make us miserable on beholding any kind of sentient suffering, the inseparable connection between virtue and happiness must thereby be destroyed. If I were afflicted with that morbid sympathy which the theory of Mr. Owen contemplates, the sight of a broken finger or a dislocated joint would make me miserable. On his hypothesis I could not be happy if a single instance of pain existed in the world. On the hypothesis that the more virtuous we are, the more acute and morbid our sensibilities, there can be no happiness or enjoyment in the practice of virtue.

From some people with whom I have reasoned on the subject of future happiness, I have heard whole theories of religion founded upon the idea that the mercy of God is not reconcilable with the idea of punishment, present or future. The system has been founded upon their view of God's mercy. I have hinted to them the danger of founding a theory of religion upon their imperfect, and, perhaps, inaccurate ideas of the character of God; and that however correct their views of divine justice or mercy, contemplated apart from all other perfections, yet the compound attributes of the divine character were beyond human comprehension. We must judge of the divine attributes from what exists in nature before our eyes, as well as from what is said in scripture. We have frequently requested such reasoners to reflect that animal and mental pain existed to a very great extent. We have asked them to imagine a great field, an *immense area*, in which all the animals of the various genera and species in the universe, that were suffering pain and disease, were congregated, what millions of suffering creatures, grouped together, each according to its kind, do we see in this *immense area*. To a man of morbid, or even of well-regulated sensibilities, what a sight is here presented! What painful sympathetic feelings are excited! If the very idea that the saddle on which I ride injures my horse's back, makes *me* feel excessively uncomfortable—how would the actual sight of all these millions of suffering animals, congregated within the limits of an undivided area, affect me? I shudder at the thought. And yet the beneficent Creator of the Universe has this sight before his eyes continually. They stand, in all their agonies, night and day, before him; and not a painful throb of their hearts, not a single spasm of nerve or muscle, that his all-seeing eye does not observe. The argument deduced is, that if it be compatible with the divine government and attributes to tolerate such a scene of animal suffering perpetually before him; how can we infer from these premises, that the future punishment of man would mar the felicity of his Creator, or be incompatible with his character? This will be received as a logical argument by all those who believe in future punishments. But the Divine Author of our nature has so constituted us that we are not to be made miserable by the contemplation of temporary or perpetual partial pain and misery. He has most

beneficently established an inseparable connection between personal virtue and personal happiness, between personal vice and personal misery; and this may well be called a divine law of human nature. But, my friend's hypothesis would lead us to conclude that, just in proportion as we become virtuous, we must become unhappy.

If there have been any argument offered by my opponent, in support of his premises, it amounts to this, *Because religion* is not founded upon the sciences of botany, agriculture, chemistry, geology, etc., because it does not make provision for the improvement of the breed of animals, *i. e.*, of men as well as dogs and horses; because it does not assimilate social man to the savage in a state of nature, without property, save his bow and arrow; because it did institute matrimony, and does not absolve men from the obligation of the marriage contract, and all other moral and civil contracts—*ergo*, it is not divine, not true, not worthy of universal reception. I affirm that from the reasonings before us, this is the logical force of the argument.

[*Here the Chairman rose and stated, that, Mr. Campbell had made an appeal to the Board of Moderators, and the Board desire to know if you wish the point to be now decided before the argument progresses. This decision seems now to be necessary, after advancing whatever you may wish to offer on this point.*]

Mr. *Owen* rose and said—This meeting was called in consequence of my undertaking to prove certain positions, and Mr. Campbell engaging to disprove them. At our first interview at Cincinnati, I proposed to Mr. Campbell that I should state the whole of my arguments first, and having gone through with them, that Mr. Campbell should reply at full length; but Mr. Campbell wished that each party should speak but half an hour at a time. Knowing that the truths I had to advocate were plain and incontrovertible, I could have no objection to Mr. Campbell's taking the course he suggested; but in consequence of our having to speak for half an hour, Mr. Campbell has been replying to he does not know what. Most probably Mr. Campbell expected that I would have taken up the arguments which he anticipated, and which he had prepared himself to refute. Had we proceeded as I suggested, Mr. Campbell would now have been in possession of the whole of my arguments, and I think by this he would have also been convinced of their incontrovertible truth. When I have got through with my arguments and illustrations, I will place my manuscript in Mr. Campbell's hands, and allow him his own time fully to consider them. This is the first morning that Mr. Campbell has attempted any answer to my arguments; and this shows that I was perfectly correct in my view of the order of this debate which I opened to Mr. Campbell at our first interview. Mr. Campbell is now beginning to come to the point.

[The Hon. Chairman rose and said—I can only observe, that the Moderators are of their former opinion, that they consider the subject now under discussion to be the first proposition in Mr. Owen's challenge, viz: an offer to prove that all religions were founded in

ignorance, from whence the implication arises that they are all false. From the beginning we have been of opinion that the rules of fair discussion required that each party should confine himself strictly to that single isolated proposition; and of this opinion we still remain, viz: that it is incorrect and illogical to deviate from the course just designated. The Board are unanimously of opinion that Mr. Owen's first proposition is the only one in controversy, and that each party should confine himself to matters strictly relevant and pertinent to that proposition. That in order to observe the established controversial rules, the party holding the affirmative of this proposition should proceed to demonstrate that all the religions, now existing in the world, originated in ignorance, and are founded in error. And after he shall have demolished all the religions, the Board consider that it would be proper for the party holding the affirmative of the proposition, to offer a substitute for the system abolished, to state what the new system is, and the consequences resulting from it; because, until the fallacy of all existing systems be detected and demonstrated, it does not follow that all the anticipated advantages of the new system may not be the legitimate results of the existing systems.]

Mr. *Owen* remarked—Having heard your wish on this point, I have strictly conformed to it: all I have been saying goes to prove the past and present ignorance of man; when I shall have exhausted this part of the discussion, I shall then adopt any course which the Board may suggest.

Mr. *Campbell* rose—Gentlemen Moderators, I agree perfectly with you in the sentiment that it would be incompatible with your feelings and the dignity of this controversy, to dictate to the disputants what course they shall pursue. I am perfectly aware of the delicacy which you must feel in exercising anything like dictation in the course of this controversy; all that I wished, was, that you would express your views relative to the manner in which the controversy has been conducted, so that they might be recorded; and that I might be authorized in adopting the course which I have suggested.

I conceive, Mr. Chairman, that I am entitled to so much of my time as has been occupied by the Board and disputants in the discussion of interlocutory topics.

[*Mr. Campbell is allowed fifteen minutes to make up his half hour.*]

Mr. *Campbell* then rose and said—Yielding to the circumstances in which I am placed, I now propose to submit to your consideration an analysis of the infant man: It is certainly true, as Lord Bacon observes, that "all our valuable knowledge of the world has been gleaned from minute observation;" therefore, an analysis of our corporeal and mental endowments, is indispensable in arriving at anything like a correct view of the creature man. I intend not to elaborate this matter, but merely to glance at the five senses of man, regarding them as the only means to the soul or mind of man through which we acquire all our simple and original ideas of the universe

around us. My object is, to demonstrate from a brief analysis of human capacity the utter impossibility of man's originating those supernatural ideas which are necessarily involved in the frame and institution of every system of religion. I know that the system of *natural religion* is founded upon the hypothesis, that man, by the exercise of his natural reason, is capable of arriving at the knowledge of God and the relations to him and one another. In order to establish the true line of demarcation in this matter, I affirm, first, that there is a God, all nature cries aloud through all her works. But we must have ears to hear this voice. In other words, all things around us and within us prove the existence of God when that idea is originated. 2. I affirm that all nations have derived their ideas of Deity (and there is no nation without these ideas), from *tradition* and not from the *light of nature*. 3. I deny that man, in possession of but five senses, and with no other guide but the light of nature, could ever have originated the idea of Deity. But it is more than probable that no human being having but five senses would be a fit subject for an experiment whereby to ascertain whether it were in human nature, unaided by the light of revelation or tradition, to originate the idea of a God; because all who have a full organization have *heard* of a Creator. Therefore, the matter is to be demonstrated on purely philosophic principles. Now the admissions are, *that all nature vouches the existence of God—that the tradition concerning God is the common moral property of all nations.* And the negative is, *that man cannot originate the idea of God.*

Now it is conceded on all hands that we have but *five senses*, and that these five senses are the only avenues through which intelligence concerning material things can reach us. These are the senses of *seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling.* For example, let us take the sense of *smelling*, as the most simple of all our senses. Now there are in nature many substances possessing odorous properties. Upon a chemical analysis we discover that these *odors* are nothing but small particles of matter, sometimes exceedingly minute. These particles falling off from the bodies, are pressed into the atmospheric air; in the process of respiration they reach our sense of smelling. They penetrate the nasal membrane, and strike upon the olfactory nerve, and the impressions which the impulse of each of the odorous particles makes upon this nerve is communicated to the sensorium. Bring a rose into a dark room, within the reach of this sense, and although we cannot see it, we know it is there, because the odorous particles flying off and commingling with the atmosphere of the room, we inhale them. This impression made upon the sensorium by means of the impulse of each particle upon the sense, we call sensation. Though it be a digression, I would call upon the materialist to reflect upon the wisdom and design manifested in placing this sense exactly where it is. Air is the real *pabulum vitæ*, but were it not for the *locale* of this sense, being in the very channel through which this fluid passes into our lungs, how could we dis-

criminate between the salubrious and insalubrious qualities of the air we inhale. We know the extent to which the most minute *miasmata* may affect our health; and although many of the odorous particles are so minute, or so weak in their impulse, as not to be sensibly felt, yet still all the grosser and more common impurities are detected by this sense. Now had the *locale* of this sense been in the *hand*, it would have been useless for the preservation of health and life. Its position therefore proves wisdom and design in its formation.

But to return, odors are material things; small particles of matter flying off from bodies, so small as to be invisible. Now, had we not this organ we should be deprived of all those ideas which come by that sense. We could not, without the sense of smelling, have any more ideas of odors than a human hand could have of music. It would be impossible to communicate to a man, born without the sense of smelling, any idea of odors, because he would be without archetype, or analogy for the conception of any such idea. The corollary then is, that all our ideas of this class are derived through the medium of this sense.

MR. OWEN'S ELEVENTH ADDRESS.

Each of these nine conditions appear to be necessary for the happiness of man, and it is almost useless to state that, they cannot be obtained under any of the governments, religions, laws, or institutions by which the characters of men have been hitherto formed, or by which they have been governed.

These conditions cannot be obtained in any society in which merit or demerit are attributed for any belief, or faith whatever, or, for liking or disliking any person or anything.

On the contrary, happiness can be obtained and secured, only when every member of society can freely express his thoughts and feelings, and when all men shall understand the laws of human nature, so well, that none shall be offended by thus acquiring an accurate knowledge of the sensations which nature compels his fellow beings to receive.

And these conditions can be enjoyed, only when a knowledge of the laws of our nature shall remove all personal pride and individual selfishness, with all desire to possess any unnecessary private property.

And also, when men and women shall not be required to perjure themselves, and promise what they have not the power to perform, before they enter into the married state; but when, on the contrary, all shall live and associate according to their affections, and shall be trained, educated, and governed by reason, instead of force, fraud, and cunning.

We will now consider each of these nine conditions, deemed requisite for human happiness, more in detail.

FIRST CONDITION.

Of possessing a good organization, physical, intellectual, and moral.

It is evident on reflection, that the happiness of every individual is materially influenced by the faculties which he derives from nature at birth.

When these are physically weak, or intellectually, or morally defective, greater care and attention are required through infancy, childhood, and youth, to strengthen the first, and improve the others, than are necessary when the organization, in these respects, is more perfect at birth.

And as the application of the most favorable circumstances, after the birth of the individual, cannot fully compensate for defective natural power, it becomes absolutely necessary for human happiness that, measures shall be adopted to prevent the production of any inferior organization in the human race.

There is a science which, when it shall be better understood, and the ignorant prejudices of mankind will permit it to be properly applied, will, to a great extent, effect this groundwork of human happiness, for it is the only foundation on which it can be permanently secured.

This science has been already partially applied with success to improve the physical qualities of many animals; and there can be no doubt of the extraordinary beneficial changes which may be made in the human race, when their knowledge of this science shall be rightly applied to improve their physical, intellectual, and moral powers.

The most valuable animal known by man, is man, and it is far more important for his happiness that he should be produced, at his birth, with all his varied powers in the best state, than that the breed of horses, cattle, sheep, dogs, etc., should be improved.

It is not, however, intended that the breed of these latter animals shall be neglected, for, in a rational state of society, no inferior animal, vegetable, or any other thing, will be produced when that which is superior can be obtained.

Consequently, the greatest attention will be given to this science, in the new state of existence, that, as far as it is practicable by human knowledge and industry, a good natural material may be obtained for all purposes, but, more especially, that the most superior physical, intellectual, and moral materials of the human race may be obtained at birth.

Under the present irrational notion of the world, this science is of little use anywhere, except as it is applied partially, to improve the breed of some of the inferior animals, and the qualities of some vegetables.

For the existing laws and institutions create only ignorant prejudices, which, not only retard every natural improvement, but by their exclusive tendencies deteriorate the whole breed of man.

In a new state of society about to be formed in accordance with the divine laws of our nature, arrangements will be made to give man the full benefit of this important science, for, without it, he cannot possess the best of everything for human nature.

SECOND CONDITION.

Of having the power to produce, at pleasure, whatever is necessary to keep the natural organization of man in the best state of health, which includes food, exercise, habitation, dress, occupation, rest, recreation, and amusements.

All will admit that the present laws, and institutions, and practices of mankind, do not permit these requisites to health, and consequently to happiness, to be obtained, anywhere, by the great mass of the population in the best manner.

The customs of the world are now such, that nine-tenths of the people, in all countries, can procure only the most common necessaries to support life; while, if the governing powers of these countries, understood their own interest, as individuals, they would know that it is injurious to each member of every community, that anything, whatever, should be produced inferior, while the power is possessed to have it superior.

It is the interest, therefore, of the governing powers, as well as of all others, that every man shall possess not only the best organization at birth, but that he shall be supplied, through life, with the best food, habitation, and dress for human nature; and that arrangements shall exist to enable him to enjoy proper exercise, rest, recreation, and amusement, and that he shall be occupied, through life, in the best manner to promote his health and happiness, and to benefit society.

Accordingly in the new state of existence, permanent arrangements will be made to secure these objects.

THIRD CONDITION.

Of an education to cultivate from infancy, the physical, intellectual, and moral powers in the best manner.

So little has been effected, upon this subject, by the laws, institutions, and customs of men, that nearly the whole of the human race are, at this hour, more ignorant of themselves, than they are of most objects around them, while it is the first interest of all, that they should be early taught to know themselves—to learn what manner of beings they are.

Hitherto none have had their physical, intellectual, and moral powers cultivated from infancy, in the best manner, but every obstacle which cunning could devise or force apply, has been placed in the way of the mass of the people, in all countries, to prevent them from attaining knowledge. Consequently, the population of the world, is now, in a most degraded condition, little better, indeed,

than beasts of burden, toiling uselessly, from morning to night without understanding for what object. It has acquired a very small part only of the powers which it might be made to possess, probably, not more than one out of a million or many millions, for when all the best faculties of the human race shall be cultivated as they ought to be, from infancy, the human mind, trained as it has been, is competent to estimate the extraordinary results that may be attained. A statement greatly within the truth on this subject would now startle the most sanguine.

Therefore in the new state of existence, arrangements will be formed, not only to obtain for man the best organization at birth ; a regular supply of the most wholesome food, the best habitation and dress, with the best means to enjoy exercise, rest, recreation, and amusement; but arrangements will be also formed, to bring out, into full action, these extraordinary new powers, by training and cultivating from infancy to maturity, the physical, intellectual, and moral faculties and qualities of *all* in the best manner.

MR. CAMPBELL'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—As this is so much of the evidence to be adduced in support of my friend's first proposition, I presume that I must submit to hear it read ; but I shall protest against its being read five times to prove the five positions. If it had the charm of being a *new* theory—if it had not been detailed to us before, and its practicability and utility had not been tested by experiment, we might with more patience and interest listen to the outline. But the experiment made in the State of Indiana has gone much farther to dissipate the influence of the illusions of my friend's philosophy upon the public mind than he is aware of.

I shall now proceed to our brief analysis of the five senses. Next to the sense of smelling is that of *tasting*, as respects simplicity in its use and operation. By this sense we become acquainted with the qualities of *aliment*, so as to discriminate the qualities between what is agreeable or disagreeable, conducive or prejudicial to health. The Author of Nature has wisely ordered the *locale* of this sense also. Located elsewhere than where it is, it would be valueless to the animal man. When a material, vegetable, animal, and sometimes mineral substance, is presented to the discrimination of this sense, the particles are solved by the *saliva* which is its adjunct. This saliva, which always moistens the organs of taste, is one of the most universal menstruums in nature, and possesses the power of solving all the aliments necessary to animals ; so as to enable the tongue to discriminate the qualities of the object as pleasing or displeasing, healthy or the contrary. The impressions made upon this organ are immediately communicated to the brain, and an idea of the savors of bodies necessary to life or health is thus acquired. Thus, after a little experience, we are enabled to discriminate the nutritious and unwholesome properties of all aliments. It is true

that this sense may be much obtunded, and that it has been grossly perverted; but it is the safest criterion by which to ascertain the healthful and agreeable properties of aliments. Whatever may be the extent of our ideas of savors or tastes, they are all derived through the medium of this sense.

Feeling being not so local in its design, but more local in its object, is wisely and beneficently transferred through the whole animal system; and through this avenue of intelligence we become acquainted with the tactile properties of bodies—their roughness, smoothness, hardness, softness, etc. etc. All these sensations, through this medium, find their way to the sensorium. The wisdom of transfusing this sense generally is as obvious as the specific location of the smell and taste. This sense, however, is not equally transfused, being most exquisite in the most useful organs, particularly in the organ of vision. It is obvious that if we could conceive a man were born without this avenue to intelligence, closed up he must ever remain in ignorance of all the tactile properties of bodies, and he could never originate the idea of material *tangibility*. The thing is physically impossible.

The sense of *hearing* is given to us that we may discriminate all the vibrations and motions of the air. Every impression made upon the outward ear reaches to the *tympanum*, and conformably to the impulse given to it, it gives us the idea of the whole *gamut* of harmonious or discordant sounds. We all know that a man born deaf can have no idea of the nature of sound, and therefore can never be taught the art of speaking, which is simply the art of making such an impression upon the auricular sense as to communicate our ideas to others through the medium of that sense.

We come next to *seeing*. This most perfect and delightful of all our senses, is, in like manner, admirably adapted to its specific object. It is the avenue of intelligence through which all our ideas of color, magnitude, and distance are derived to us; and the impressions made upon this sense reach the sensorium through the optic nerves.

Now it is only necessary to name these five senses, and their respective uses, in order to discover in them all that beneficence, wisdom, and design which suggest the idea of a supremely intelligent First Cause, manifesting its wisdom and benevolence in the animal organization of man, to discover that man has been endowed by his Creator with an organization which enables him to elicit every valuable property of matter. We discover an admirable adaptation of these senses to the conception of all ideas of colors, sounds, odors, tastes, and tacts; and that all our intelligence on these subjects is derived through these five channels.

The conclusion, therefore, from these premises, is, that a man born without any one of these senses, must ever remain destitute of all ideas derivable through it; that a man born deaf, dumb, blind, and without tactability, has all these avenues to intelligence closed up,

and must therefore remain an idiot all his lifetime. Is it not self-evident that a blind-born man can never acquire any ideas of colors, nor a deaf-born man any idea of sounds? But if we would suppose a man born destitute of all the five senses, he would not only be idiotic, but he would be a lump of insensible matter. Well, if all the ideas we have of sensible objects are derived through these *media*, there must be a model or archetype of each of these ideas presented to the appropriate sense. Before I can have an idea of the color or shape of a rose, it must be brought within the jurisdiction or cognizance of my ocular and olfactory sense. Therefore, every writer who has undertaken to analyze the senses, has come to the conclusion that we cannot have an idea of material objects, or the qualities of matter, that is not derived from the exercise of our senses upon the material objects around us. Well now, this being the basis of all our knowledge, the powers which we call rational, or intellectual, are necessarily circumscribed by the simple ideas thus acquired. The senses put us in possession of all the materials which the intellect has to work up—in like manner as the raw material must first be put into the hands of the manufacturer before it can be manufactured for the various uses of life. All mechanical or intellectual ingenuity is unavailable without the material. There can be no ship without timber—no penknife without metal. Thus a child, from the time its powers of discriminating sensible objects begin to be developed, acquires a fund of materials, or simple ideas, on which its intellect begins to operate.

In consequence of inattention, we imagine that children are making no advances in information during the first months of their existence. But a superficial observer can form no idea of the important acquisitions of knowledge made by an infant in the first few months after its birth. It is employed most industriously in learning to use its hands, to move its different members, to adjust its different senses to their proper objects. The minute observer will notice its first efforts to trim its eyes so as to have a discriminating vision; he will remark how its soft pulpy fingers are in almost continual exercise in order to acquire a discriminating tact.

There are many mysteries existing in our animal economy which have never yet been developed. We well know that upon the first presentation of a candle to the vision of an infant, there is one distinct and separate impression made upon the retina of each eye, precisely as if two candles were in the first instance presented to the vision of the infant. How comes it then to pass that the infant mind has such a power of minute attention, as very early to have a consciousness of the presence of but one candle. There are many secrets yet inexplicable in the operations of each of these senses. I will mention one which the wisest physiologists have not yet been able to explain. It is well known that there is no anatomical connection between the nerves or muscular systems of either eye; that the muscles which control the movements of each eye are as inde-

pendent as those which move each arm; yet we turn both eyes involuntarily at the same moment to any particular object, giving precisely the same turn to both our organs of vision. This is as perfect in the new-born infant as in the full grown man. The mind appears in its first acts to possess a sort of innate power over the organs of vision. From the first dawn of rationality the mind appears conscious that illusion has been practiced by the singular phenomena of two distinct impressions upon the retina of either eye. No one has yet fathomed these physical mysteries of animal economy, nor is it any part of my present business to attempt to fathom them. It is enough for me to establish the position that all our ideas of sensible objects are derived from, and only derivable through, the five senses; that the mind begins to operate upon these materials as soon as they are presented to the senses, and that this gives us the first intimation of the existence of infantile intellect. Having rather stated, than analyzed the power called *sensation*, let us turn our thoughts a moment to *perception*.

The mind forms ideas in accordance with the sensations impressed upon the brain. The mind is perfectly conscious of the existence of these impressions; they are communicated directly to the *sensorium;* and here begins the intellect process of reflecting upon, comparing, and recalling them; then presenting them in different views, separating, abstracting, combining, and generalizing them. All this is in the natural operation of the intellect on the objects presented to it by sensation. Thus it is that we derive our ideas of sensible objects, and thus we begin to reason upon them. *Therefore*, we cannot *imagine* a *sixth* sense—we cannot conceive what it would be. The reason is, that we have never seen any animal possessed of it. Had we been endowed but with four senses it would have been equally impossible to conceive of a fifth sense; with but three, of a fourth, etc. These are truths which I think must be palpable to the plainest understanding, and which require no philosophic subtilty in their elucidation. Now, to expect a man destitute of the light of revelation to have ideas not derivable through any of his senses, would be as absurd as to expect a man, without the organs of vision, to have all the ideas of color possessed by those who enjoy the very clearest vision. You might as reasonably expect a person born deaf to have all the ideas of harmony, as a man destitute of supernatural revelation to have the ideas of God and a spiritual system—without seeing or hearing some supernatural personage, all natural objects would be inadequate to originate any spiritual ideas. Many experiments have been made upon the deaf, who have been restored to hearing, to ascertain whether by the other senses, and all the reasonings which the mental powers were capable of, they had acquired any idea of God; and all have concurred in attesting the utter impossibility of acquiring such without the aid of revelation. No, my friends, the man on whom the light of revelation has never beamed, can no more conceive of those ideas which in a system of spiritual

religion are native, inherent, and discoverable, than the deaf-born man can be moved by the "concord of sweet sounds." It would be as rational to talk of seeing by the hand, or hearing by the tongue, as to talk of knowing God without a communication from himself. We can by things already known be taught things not known; but there must be a teacher.

But I must tell you, while speaking of *revelation*, that perhaps I am misunderstood; and certainly I am, if I am supposed to use this term in the vulgar sense. For now it is usual to call the whole Bible a revelation from God. I must explain myself here. There are a thousand historic facts narrated in the Bible, which it would be absurd to regard as immediate and direct *revelation* from the Almighty. Paine defines revelation very accurately, although he did not believe we had any, properly so called. He says, page 14, "Age of Reason,"—"Revelation cannot be applied to anything done upon earth. It is a communication of something which the person to whom that thing is revealed did not know before"—and I add, could not otherwise know. (That intelligence which could never have been derived to us through the agency of our senses.)—"Consequently all the historical and anecdotal part of the Bible is not within the compass and meaning of the word revelation." *Revelation*, from the import of the term, must be supernatural. But the historic parts of both testaments, present a great variety of topographical and historic facts and incidents; colloquies between friends and enemies, of apostles, prophets, and patriarchs, and of distinguished persons, good and evil; wars, intrigues, amours, and crimes of every dye. Now it would be neither philosophical nor rational to dignify and designate these colloquies, narratives, geographical and biographical notices, etc., by the term *revelation*. The term revelation, in its strict acceptation among intelligent christians, means nothing more or less than a Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things, a knowledge of which man could never have attained by the exercise of his reason upon material and sensible objects; for as Paul says, "Things which the eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man to conceive, has God revealed to us apostles, and we declare them to you." Now the corollary is, that, to a man to whom this divine revelation has never been made, it is as impossible to acquire ideas of spiritual and eternal things, as for a blind man to admire the play of colors in a prism.

In the Old Testament, to distinguish the ordinary information from the divine communications, such intimations are made as "*The word of the Lord*," or "*A message from the Lord came*" to such a person. Sometimes, "*The Lord said.*" But in the New Testament, the phrase "*The Word*," or "*The word of the Lord*," or "*The Truth*," is almost exclusively appropriated to *the testimony which God gave concerning the person and mission of Jesus Christ.* It may also be remarked, that in a volume such as the Bible is, and having the object which

it professes, it was necessary that the worst deeds and the best deeds of all sorts of men, in all sorts of circumstances, should be detailed. It *teaches* us man, it develops human nature, it *reveals* to us the character and purpose of the Maker of the universe. Moreover, the persons who are employed to make these communications are so supernaturally guided as to make them infallible witnesses in all the facts they attest, as well as all the communications concerning supernatural things. The ridicule which some ignorant skeptics have uttered against the contents of the book, under the general title of a revelation from God, as if it were all properly so called, is, if it have any point, only directed against their own obtusity of intellect, and negligence in making themselves acquainted with the most important of all books in the world.

Our reasoning upon these premises must therefore necessarily be in the following order. Objects of sense are presented to the infant mind, it perceives them, begins to reflect upon them, and after exercising its power of discrimination, it arrives at certain conclusions respecting them. And this leads us to notice the intellectual powers of man. 1. *Perception*, by which we become acquainted with all things external. 2. *Memory*, by which we are enabled to recall things past. 3. *Consciousness*, which acquaints us with all things internal. Perception has present sensible objects for its province. Memory is the record which we have of the past. But consciousness has respect only to things present. I perceive a numerous assemblage now before me, and I am *conscious* of my own thoughts at the time. I *remember* that there were such and such persons here yesterday. These three powers of perception, memory, and consciousness, are the primary powers of the mind. Over these three we have shown that the will has no power ; that they are independent of volition. For example, I often have perceptions contrary to my volitions ; matters written upon the table of my memory, by singular associations, will involuntarily present themselves in a vivid manner before me, and it certainly is felt by all, that our being conscious of our own thoughts depends not upon any act of the will, but upon the constitution of mind itself. But in exercising the faculties of recollecting, reflecting, imagining, reasoning, and judging, I discover that all these are subject to the control of my volition. For example, in exercising the faculty of imagination, I can, at will, transfer the external peculiarities of one animal to the body of another, and thereby create any kind of imaginative monster ; I can by imagination take the head, trunk, and arms of a man, and put them on horseback, and thereby present to my mind's eye, the fabulous Centaur. But this license of imagination is entirely under the control of my volition. I can recollect only by making an effort, and consequently must determine to make that effort. I can reason only when I decide to reason ; and my placing myself in the attitude of a judge, is as much in obedience to a previous determination, as the eating of my supper, or my going to bed. These matters are so

plain to those who do reflect, that to demonstrate them, appears something like an insult to the understanding of such an audience as this.

I was about to state some facts in proof, that the deaf cannot form an idea of God, a future state, or of a human spirit. But I am informed my half hour is out.*

MR. OWEN'S TWELFTH ADDRESS.

FOURTH CONDITION.

Of having the means and inclination to promote continually the happiness of our fellow-beings, as far as our power can be made to extend, and also to assist in increasing, as far as practicable, the enjoyments of all that has life.

The governments, religions, laws, institutions and practices, of the world, have not been yet devised to promote the happiness of man, or the comfort of animals. They have been contrived, rather, to

---

* From some cause these facts were not given in the Debate. The next speech failed to call them forth. I shall just state one case here, as a specimen of the documents alluded to. I believe all experiments yet made upon such persons, have proved that faith, or the knowledge of God, and of a Creator, has come by hearing. By faith, Paul said, and not by reason, "we know that the worlds were made by the word of God." This case is extracted from "The Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences at Paris"—

"The son of a tradesman in Chartres, who had been deaf from his birth, and consequently dumb, when he was twenty-three or twenty-four years of age, began on a sudden to speak, without its being known that he had ever heard. This event drew the attention of every one, and many believed it to be miraculous. The young man, however, gave a plain and rational account, by which it appeared to proceed wholly from natural causes. He said that about four months before he was surprised by a NEW, and pleasing sensation, which he afterward discovered to arise from the ringing of bells; that as yet he heard with one ear, but afterward a kind of water came from his left ear, and then he could hear distinctly with both; and from this time he listened with the utmost curiosity and attention to the sounds which accompany those motions of the lips which he had before remarked to convey ideas or meaning from one person to another. In short, he was able to understand them, by noting the thing to which they related, and the action they produced. And after repeated attempts to imitate them when alone, at the end of four months he thought himself able to talk. He, therefore, without having intimated what had happened, began at once to speak, and affected to join in conversation, though with much more imperfection than he was aware.

"Many divines immediately visited him, and questioned him concerning God, and the soul, moral good, and evil, and many other subjects of the same kind; but of all this they found him ignorant, though he had been used to go to mass, and had been instructed in all the externals of devotion, as making the sign of the cross, looking upward, kneeling at proper seasons, and using gestures of penitence, and prayer. Of death itself, which may be considered as a sensible object, he had very confused, and imperfect ideas, nor did it appear that he had ever reflected upon it. His life was little more than animal, and sensitive. He seemed to be contented with the simple perception of such objects as he could perceive, and did not compare his ideas with each other, nor draw inferences, as might have been expected from him. It appeared, however, that his understanding was vigorous, and his apprehension quick, so that his intellectual defects must have been caused, not by the barrenness of the soil, but merely by the want of necessary cultivation."

insure the misery of man, and the discomfort of animal life. The very supposition that man was organized by nature to give him the power to think and feel according to his own pleasure, was of itself, when carried into practice, as it has been by all tribes and people, quite sufficient to stay any progress toward the happiness of the human race.

This single mistake, respecting human nature, is abundantly sufficient to disunite all mankind, and to make them secret or open enemies to each other. For while each man or woman is taught to believe, that every other man and woman, may, if they please, think and feel as they do, it becomes natural for them to be angry with those, who, they imagine, will not, from obstinacy or some worse motive, believe what *they* believe, who do not like, or dislike, or love and hate, according to their notions of right or wrong.

It is upon this error that all governments, religions, laws, institutions, languages and customs have been formed, and, by it, they have been all made so complex and irrational. And it is solely owing to this error that the world has been so long divided against itself, that it has been always armed for its own destruction, and rendered wholly blind to the natural, and, therefore, easily attained means of happiness.

Instead of this confusion of intellect, and consequent division of feelings among the human race, man will be trained "to know himself" from infancy, and he will then acquire the inclination to promote the happiness of his fellow-beings, and of the means by which to apply the inclination to practice.

FIFTH CONDITION.

Of the means and inclination to increase, continually, our stock of knowledge.

As men acquire experience they learn the value of real knowledge, they discover that it is the only solid foundation for virtue and happiness, and that it is the true source of power. Hitherto the book of nature or of real knowledge has been sealed, in such a manner, that no man has yet dared to open it honestly and fairly, for the benefit of the many.

Innumerable books, however, said to be of divine origin, have been spread over the world, and palmed upon the public as books of real knowledge.

The fables which they contain have been made to fill the minds of men with all manner of error, and to compel them to commit all kinds of evil, as at this day, as is evident to all who can reflect without prejudice.

All these spurious books of divine origin are full of high-sounding words in praise of virtue, and learning, and religion; but we now discover, by an unerring standard of truth, that the authors of these dogmas and mysteries did not know anything of real virtue, knowledge, or religion; or, if they did, that they purposely devised

these fables to deceive mankind, to keep them in ignorance, that they might be more easily governed, and made to support the governing few in luxury and idleness, to the injury of all parties.

It is now evident that the reign of these mysteries is rapidly passing away; that it is about to be superseded by knowledge derived from tangible facts, by the only kind of knowledge that ever can be of real benefit to mankind.

Now, when this description of knowledge shall be taught from infancy to all men, they will have pleasure in acquiring it, and the farther they proceed, the greater will be their gratification, and the more ardently will they desire to pursue it.

The acquisition of the knowledge, founded on facts, in unison with all other facts, and its truth proved by its accordance with the knowledge previously known and ascertained to be true, will create a continually increasing desire to add, day by day, to the stock acquired in childhood and youth, and thus will the inclination be formed, and permanently established to seek to progress in real knowledge through life.

In the new state of existence effectual means will be devised to satisfy the desires. Every individual will have the benefit of the best libraries, laboratories, instruments, and implements to assist him in his studies. Men of the most experience, and best minds, and dispositions will be always ready to aid the younger in every branch of knowledge, while all the means will surround the population to enable them to prove the truth of their theories by practice.

The acquisition of real knowledge will accumulate enormous power to the human race, and to its extension; age after age, there can be no assignable limit. It will be the legitimate means of agreeably and beneficially changing men's sensations; of opening new stores of pleasure which will never satiate, and they will be led on, step by step, in the path of real knowledge, and made more and more acquainted with that power which gives them an existence and hourly support.

In fact the chief design in the new state of existence, will be to train the young in the best manner, and to provide the means for all to increase continually in the most useful knowledge, and to create the desire to make the greatest attainment in the most valuable pursuits.

SIXTH CONDITION.

Of the means of employing the best society, and more particularly of associating at pleasure with those for whom we feel the highest regard and greatest affection.

Without this power, whatever may be the other advantages accumulated around any society, their condition cannot be satisfactory. All who have had extensive experience, know that by far the largest share of happiness arises, through life, from the society of those to

whom we are compelled, by nature, to feel the most regard and the strongest affection.

With this privilege, few things, beyond the simple necessaries of life, are requisite to insure a considerable degree of satisfaction of mind, and a nearer approach to happiness than power, wealth, and knowledge, combined, can give without it.

But as the world has hitherto been governed, how very few have possessed the privilege of associating at pleasure with those for whom they were compelled to feel the greatest regard and strongest affection! How few enjoy it at this moment over all the world!

All past institutions have been formed apparently with the intention of obstructing, as much as possible, the happiness that nature designs man should enjoy from his social feelings by implanting so deeply and widely the seeds of affection among the human race. For all the artificial arrangements, by man, in all countries and at all times, appear to be purposely calculated to destroy the pleasures arising from sincerity, confidence, and affection.

The division of society into governors and governed, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, into single families, into sects and classes, and into numerous tribes and people taught to have opposing feelings for each other, all tend to deteriorate society, and to give a wrong or unnatural direction to all the kindlier feelings of our nature, and to render it difficult or almost impossible, in most cases, for individuals to associate at pleasure with those for whom they cannot avoid having the most regard and strongest affection.

In the new state of existence this great evil will not be known—every obstacle to the free, open, honest communication between mind and mind will be removed. In this state of society all intercourse between human beings of both sexes, and of all ages, will be, at all times, what is now termed confidential, that is, they will express, under all circumstances, their genuine thoughts and feelings without any reservation whatever.

Not feeling the necessity for disguising their sensations, they will never acquire the habit of doing so. While, under the existing institutions, almost the whole communication between man and man, and nation and nation, is a continued system of insincerity, by which they endeavor to deceive each other; and when they succeed, it is to their own injury.

The necessity which exists, under these institutions, to cover our real thoughts and feelings from others, is, of itself, sufficient to degrade man below the inferior animals, and to inflict misery on his whole race.

By attending to the feelings of children, we discover, that man is most powerfully impelled by his nature, to be honest and sincere, and to hide or be ashamed of any of the sensations which, by his formation, he is compelled to receive. It requires constant watching and great care on the part of those who are around children, to prevent them from expressing all their sensations, and telling the whole

truth upon every subject, as far as they know it, and still more exertion to force them to acquire as much practical deceit, as the irrational customs of the most civilized nations require.

All this degradation and subjugation of the very finest and best feelings of human nature will altogether cease in the new state of existence; for all the practical arrangements, and all the institutions in this state, will be in unison with the laws of nature, and, when the results of this union of practice and principle shall be enjoyed, it will be felt to be an act of insanity, or a real aberration of the human faculties, whenever any individual in conversation with man, woman, or child shall not express the genuine sensations which the existing circumstances make on his organization. Those sensations are, alone, to him, truth; and as soon as men shall be trained to be rational, and shall be under institutions and within circumstances in unison with their training, truth alone will be known among them.

And, under these arrangements, all will know precisely the impressions which their conduct makes upon others, and a stronger stimulus to every kind of excellence, cannot be given; it will effectually purify the thoughts and feelings of all, and produce a perfection of conduct throughout society, of which the present ignorant, degraded, and irrational race can form no adequate conception.

When sincerity and truth, and consequently rationality, shall be alone known among men, it will be soon ascertained, by experience, whether nature intended to give man happiness, by limiting or extending his affections; whether she intends him to confine his most exclusive feelings to one of the opposite sex, or to divide it with more than one, and how many.

However this may prove by experience, we may be assured, when no artificial obstructions shall exist, that the dictates of nature are those which she intends shall, alone, influence to actions that shall the most effectually promote real virtue and happiness.

Nature, which is now thwarted in every advance to urge the human race to knowledge and happiness, will preserve, until her righteous laws shall be alone obeyed, and they will ultimately direct the intercourse of society as wisely for the well doing, well being, and enjoyment of the human race, as she has ever done among the whole of the animal and vegetable existences, which are, in this respect, subject to the same general laws.

One thing is most evident, that nature, by keeping the power of making new impressions to herself, never intended that man or woman should perjure themselves by promising, to each other, that their sensations from and for each other, should continue, without change, until death.

In the new state of existence, this crime, also, of perjury, will be unknown, for there will be "no indissoluble marriages, or giving in marriage;" on the contrary, all will, at all times, possess the power

to associate with those only for whom nature compels them to feel the most regard and strongest affection.

SEVENTH CONDITION.

Of traveling with convenience and advantage.

To have the means of traveling at pleasure, or of removing, without inconvenience, from one district to another, is essential to the full enjoyment of happiness.

This benefit will be provided, in a very effectual manner, in the new state of existence, by arrangements which will be equally advantageous for the traveler and for society.

The arrangements which will be formed, under this new mode of existence, will be so formed, that when any country shall be regularly settled under its regulations, the traveler will have an opportunity of resting in any direction in which he may proceed, within two miles of the last association or station he may have left or passed.

He will find, in all these places, whatever can be necessary to his comfort; the same as he enjoyed in the association or society from whence he commenced his travels. It will not be necessary for him to encumber himself with luggage of any description; there will be supplies of all he will require, ready for his use, in each society, and these, as before stated, will be within two miles of each other in whatever direction he may travel.

These journeys must be, of necessity, subject to general regulations, which will apply equally to all of the same age; for it is evident, all cannot travel at the same time. But it is probable that more than all who wish to change their position at one time, may leave their station without inconvenience.

As long as travelers do not go out of the territories occupied by the associations who have embraced the new mode of existence, they will not require money or extra provisions of any description, because they will be equally at home, wherever they may wish to stop, for a longer or shorter period.

The only condition to which they will be liable, is, that they shall occupy themselves, as long as they remain in their new situation, in the same manner in which they were employed in their former association.

When the change is in progress, from the old to the new state of existence, money of the countries to which the traveler is about to proceed will be supplied to him from the public treasury.

But rational, as all these reformed, or re-created beings will become, under the new circumstances by which they can be surrounded, no funds, or labor, of the societies, will be uselessly expended. They will all distinctly perceive that a well arranged economy, in the whole proceedings of these communities, is the true foundation of the highest and most permanent prosperity.

Whatever temporary difficulties may arise, at first, in bringing all the requisite arrangements for traveling with ease, comfort, and

general benefit into practice, a little experience and perseverance, in right principles, will soon overcome them.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWELFTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—There is a land in which there is no sickness, in which, eating, drinking, and sleeping are unnecessary. I am well aware that in argument so abstract in its nature as the present, we cannot go into such details as to make every topic perfectly apprehensible to all. We have been attending to a brief analysis of our external senses, and internal faculties. To aid the least accustomed to this kind of reasoning, we shall present the substance in a new form. Let us imagine that there are five worlds, and that we have a distinct organ calculated exclusively for the use of each distinct world—that there is a world of colors, cognizable by the eye; a world of sounds, cognizable by the ear; a world of odors, cognizable by the olfactory sense; a world of savors, cognizable by the taste; and a world of *tacts*, that is, of the tactile properties of bodies, all the ideas belonging to which world are cognizable only by the sense of feeling. Now these five worlds make up this one material world and all the properties which belong to it; and he that lacks one of these organs or senses, is forever debarred from that world of which it is the door.

Sensation is the name which philosophers have given to the exercise of these senses, or rather to the operation by them which makes us acquainted with the material world. *Perception* is the name given to those acts of the mind which discriminate the different sensations or impressions made upon our senses. It is called the faculty of perception to distinguish it from other faculties, such as memory or imagination. By this faculty we become acquainted with all things external; but to-morrow all the ideas of to-day derived through the faculty of perception become the objects of memory, that having respect exclusively to the past. Next comes *consciousness*, which is like an internal eye, enabling me to take cognizance of my recollections, reasonings, and all the operations of my intellect—such as reflecting, comparing, discriminating, and judging. These are the primary intellectual operations, and they are all necessary in order to arrive at certain conclusions on material things or the dominions of these five worlds. But then there is the world of spirits, which no man could imagine, and of which these five worlds do not afford an archetype, or sensation, or perception. Of this world we have many ideas, thoughts, terms, and conversations, and the question is, *How did we come by them?* No window or door has been opened to us in the department of sense. Where are the organs, the senses, the *media*, through which we have derived these ideas? Not by the eye, the ear, nor the taste; for these are our corporeal senses, and cannot take cognizance of spiritual existences. For all our ideas of spiritual and eternal things we must, therefore, be indebted to some other power.

The human intellect has no *creative* power. It can only reason from the known to the unknown. We can augment almost *ad infinitum*, but we cannot create. And so it is in the material world.—It is a law of physics that one new particle of matter cannot be created. We can change and modify; we can convert a fluid into a solid, a shapeless piece of wood into a polished piece of furniture; but we can neither create or destroy one particle of matter. And just so it is in the operations of our intellectual faculties upon sensible objects. Conceding to my friend that imagination ranges wildly through the intellectual world, yet all philosophic skeptics, and christians, have admitted that although imagination may "body forth the forms of things unknown," it is only by analogy to things already known, that they can be "turned to shapes," and receive a "local habitation and a *name*." Imagination, is to the intellectual world, what mechanical ingenuity is to the natural world. In neither can any result be elaborated without a stock to begin upon. Our position is that imagination can do no more with ideas, than mechanical ingenuity can with metals, wood, and stone—that the intellectual as well as the mechanical artificer must have his subject before him. Hence it is utterly out of the power of imagination to originate the idea of spiritual existences, or even to invent a name expressive of a spiritual idea.

But to give the argument its plain practical application, and greatest force, we must contemplate another endowment of man. I mean the faculty of speech. This topic is intimately connected with the preceding. What is this faculty? It is the power not only of giving utterance to our feelings, but of giving names to things. How did we come by the use of speech? is it *natural* to man to speak? or is not language rather, purely an *imitative* thing. I may show this tumbler to an infant, and thus afford matter for its perception, memory, and consciousness to operate upon; but will its perception, memory, or consciousness, enable it to give a name to this vessel. I may, perhaps, hazard the disapprobation of this audience, by asserting that speech is not natural to man. Groans and inarticulate enunciations, expressive of passion or feeling, are natural to almost all animals. But man differs from them all in the following respect: they all have a systematic expression uniformly the same; but man, without language, has such groans and sighs, and expressions of feeling without system. The speechless babes have no uniformity of this sort. But the horse, the ass, the cow, the sheep, the goat, the swallow, the sparrow, have, wherever found, the same language of passion and feeling. The nightingale and the lark sing the same song all the world over. But when we speak of language, we mean not enunciations indicative of feeling, but names for ideas or sentiments. But let us ask, How do infants learn to speak? Do they speak as naturally as they see or smell? Surely not. They sigh, groan, cry, and laugh naturally, but *imitatively* they speak. Speech is the result of education, of training, and of the imitative

faculty of man. It has been experimentally demonstrated that a man who has never *heard* the articulations of the human voice can never speak. A child may be born with the most perfect organs of speech, and yet be born dumb, and continue dumb through life, in consequence of the imperfection of its auricular organs. Dumbness is the necessary consequence, the inseparable adjunct of deafness from birth. If there be a language of nature it is a language of inarticulate sounds, which all abandon as soon as they learn to speak. This is a fact of vast consequence in this argument. Admitting that there is a natural enunciation of feeling, and a language of pains and joys, this language is abandoned when what is now called human language is taught. All philosophers have been baffled in their attempts to account for the origin of language, and all nations have concurred in declaring that speech was the gift of the gods. The most ancient of the Egyptian writers (and these are of higher antiquity than any other extant) concur in declaring that they are utterly unable to account for the origin of human speech without referring it to God. The impossibility of inventing a universal language is very obvious; because in order to invent a new language common to all, all must be congregated, and a conventional vocabulary must be adopted—for instance, they must agree unanimously that this glass shall be called *tumbler*. But how could they be congregated or enter upon this business without the possession of that identical universal language which the scheme contemplates? There is no speculation on the origin of language to be found in any of the schools, that warrants the conclusion that man, by the unaided exercise of his native, inherent powers, could have attained to the use of speech; or that language could have been communicated to man, in the first instance, by any but a divine instructor. Speech, like faith, comes by the ear; whatever comes by the ear is derived; therefore human language is derived. Whatever is derived is not natural; human language is derived; therefore human language is not natural. In proof of the syllogism, the deaf cannot speak. The idea of anything must necessarily be precedent and anterior to the invention of a name for it. All nations must have had an idea of Deity before the word *God*, in their respective languages, could have been invented. Fifty years ago there was not to be found in all the books and all the vocabularies in the world, such a word as *steamboat;* and why? Because at that period, the *idea* of *steamboat* had not been conceived, consequently no name could be annexed to an idea which had no existence. How then were the ideas and names of God, Spirit, Altar, Priest, Sacrifice, derived to man? The idea of these, and all positive acts of religious worship, must necessarily have existed antecedently to the invention of names to express them. The conclusion is irresistible, that the invention of the terms by which spiritual ideas are expressed, must have been posterior to the conception of the ideas themselves—that as these ideas could not have been derived through the *media* of the five senses, they must have

been communicated in some other way, and that both the ideas and names of spiritual things must have been matter of divine revelation. By a reference to the Old Testament we shall find these facts fully established in evidence. And if the Bible facts did not support our reasoning, we would nevertheless be constrained to regard it as logical and demonstrative as any that can be brought to bear upon an abstract speculation. But I am not compelled to rest the truth of this reasoning upon metaphysical deductions. We have matters of fact to go upon. The Bible tells us most emphatically that the first colloquies ever held upon this earth were between the great Creator and our first ancestors, *viva voce*. The book of Genesis tells us that the first pair *talked* with God; hence the inference from the fact, that God first *taught* man to speak, is, that the art of speaking is not native and inherent in the family of man. Newton has sagely observed that God has given us both reason and religion in the gift of speech; that the power of ratiocination is but an adjunct of the faculty of speech. There is no logical objection to the *dictum* of Newton, that God gave to man both reason and religion in the gift of speech. I presume that it would be very difficult to prove, by any process of philosophical reasoning, that man could correctly reason or have spiritual ideas without the use of speech. In truth, we think by words, and infants think by things; and let him who imagines he can think without terms make the experiment.

But for these purposes it is not necessary that man should have an extensive vocabulary. He only requires two lessons—first, the elementary ideas; and, secondly, the elementary words significant to them: and then who shall prescribe limits to the range of his intellectual powers? He will soon multiply his conceptions and his terms beyond the powers of numbers to express. But he must have the data, or some stock, to trade upon.

Moses tells us that God called the animals in Paradise around Adam, and that he tried Adam's skill in speech, by requiring him to give names to them. He gave them names; and we are told that Adam's nomenclature was *correct*. But we can trace the *phenomenon* of language up to the root, although we cannot, on philosophic principles, account for the origin of language. We find in Europe twenty-seven languages; and by tracing them up, we find that they are kindred branches from three roots; that these three roots of European languages are scions of one single stock is highly probable, and that this root was Hebrew. Whether this root was Hebrew, or some other eastern language, is more matter of philosophical curiosity than of importance to our argument. But there can be no question that all languages are traceable up to the same fountain.

In the nomenclature of animals, respect was had to the qualities of the animal, therefore the idea of the distinguishing characteristic of the animal must necessarily have existed before the animal itself could have been designated by any specific name. If the Hebrew

was not the first language ever spoken, it has, nevertheless, internal evidences of having been founded upon these primitive elementary principles as illustrated in the nomenclature of animals.

In Hebrew the zoological nomenclature is always analogous to the characteristic quality of the animal. "Thus the original Hebrew names of many of the beasts and birds of that region are apparently formed by *onomatopœia*, or in imitation of their natural cries or notes: so the general name given to the tamer animals, sheep and kine, was *beme*, in which sound the lowing of the one, and the bleating of the other, seems to be imitated; so the name of the *common ass*, ORUD, and of the *wild ass*, PRA, resembles their braying. The name of the *raven*, OREB, was doubtless taken from its hoarse croaking; of the *sparrow*, TSIPPOR, from its chirping; of the *partridge*, QUERA, from the note she uses in calling her young; and the murmur of the *turtle-dove* is exactly expressed by its Hebrew name TUR, and evidently gave rise to it. Many other instances of the kind might be produced; but these are sufficient to show, at least, the great probability, that some of the first names given to the several tribes of animals were derived from their respective notes."

But the instances already adduced are sufficient to show, that, in the primitive formation of language, respect was had in the nomenclature of animals, to the analogies and accordance of articulate and inarticulate sounds. But this was not the only plan adopted in the primitive nomenclature of animals. The primeval nomenclators not only took cognizance of the vocal peculiarities of animals, but also of their characteristics. Hence the *camel* was called *gimel* because supposed to be of a vindictive temper. A sheep was called *rachel*, because of its meekness; a ram was called *agil*, because of its agility; in like manner a goat was called *sair* from its being hairy.

Thus they took the vocal and other qualities of animals, and from their observation of these they formed their zoological nomenclature. Well, then, the analogical argument goes to prove, and, indeed compels us to conclude, that the annexation of the names of God, spirit, angel, altar, priest, sacrifice, etc., must have been posterior to the conception of the spiritual ideas which these terms express. The corollary to be derived from analyzing the five senses and this superadded gift of speech, is, that we can neither have ideas concerning spiritual things, nor names, without the aid of immediate and direct revelation; that, without revelation, we could no more conceive of these ideas than we could invent names for them. The child born in France, we know, by experience, will acquire the language of that country; the child born in Italy will speak Italian, because they are artificially taught to speak the mother's language; but if language was natural to man, all children would speak the same language. On the hypothesis that the first pair were created in a state of infancy, or of adolescence, the difficulty concerning the origin of language remains equally inexplicable.

Children at birth, it is said, have been excluded by circumstances

from all access to the sound of the human voice; and after arriving at maturity, it has been discovered that they have no more of the gift of speech than brutes have; and from all the premises before us the conclusion follows out irresistibly that speech is as legitimately the subject of divine revelation as religion itself; or to express the conclusion in other words, the inevitable inference is, the idea of God, altar, priest, victim, etc., is older than the names. But two ways only can ideas be communicated: first, by presenting the archetype, or that which produces the idea to the external sense; or, secondly, by *speech*, describing the thing to be revealed or communicated by something already known. Now as the language of a people is the only infallible test of their improvement and civilization, so the name of God, altar, priest, victim, found among the most savage tribes of antiquity, incapable of abstract reason or sentimental refinement, is a positive proof that none of them did ever invent the idea. This would be as decisive proof, were all the premises, clearly understood, as the discovery of a gold or silver coin or medal found among a people ignorant of metals and their natures, would be, that they were not the makers, but the finders or borrowers of this coin. I boldly assert here, and I court objection to the assertion, that every principle of sound reasoning, and all facts and documents in the annals of time, compel us to the conclusion that the idea and name of God first entered the human family by revelation. No man ever uttered a sentence more unphilosophic, more contrary to human experience, observation, and right reason, than Mirabaud, when he declared that *savages* invented the idea and name of God and spiritual existences. He might as well have averred that savages, without fire, without a mould, and without metal, made the first gold coins.

MR. OWEN'S THIRTEENTH ADDRESS.

My friends, I proceeded this forenoon as far as the eighth provision necessary to human happiness: I have, therefore, only to read the eighth and ninth in order to finish all I have before me; and then my friend Mr. Campbell and myself may come, perhaps, to closer quarters.

[*Here Mr. Owen reads to the end of the Appendix, and his half hour is out.*]

EIGHTH CONDITION.

Of release from all superstitious fears, supernatural notions, and from the fear of death.

In the new state of existence all children will be taught to perceive, to investigate, and to compare facts, and to deduce accurate conclusions, by comparing one fact carefully with another. The foundation of the human mind will thus rest upon a knowledge of facts all in unison one with another; and its formation will proceed, day by day, by adding a clear perception of one law of nature to

another, until each mind will thus acquire for itself an increasing standard of truth, which will guard it from youth against the reception of errors of the imagination. In minds thus cultivated, superstitious or unnatural fears will never enter. They will never become so irrational as to imagine any laws of nature for which they can discover no fact, but they will study to acquire an accurate knowledge of those laws to the extent their minds can investigate them; and knowing, as they will speedily learn, that truth is one throughout the whole universe, and that there can be no opposition or contradiction between any one truth and another, their minds will soon attain so much strength and knowledge, that an error will not find admittance therein.

Every error, presented to a mind so trained and formed, will be immediately compared with the true ideas already received by the study of facts—of facts, the truth of which all are compelled to admit, because they have been previously found, after the most severe investigation, to be in strict accordance with all the ascertained laws of nature. This comparison will soon detect its fallacy by showing its opposition to those established facts, or to the unchanging laws of nature; and in consequence, it will be as impracticable for the mind to give it reception among its true ideas, as for the stomach to receive the most loathsome food, when attempted to be forced into it.

The human mind will thus become, for the first time since its existence, sane and rational; for all the ideas with which it will be filled, will be in unison with each other; there will be no complexity or confusion among them—all will be harmony within.

There will be no jarring between natural feelings and imaginary divine commands in direct opposition to those feelings; for it will be known that the natural feelings of the human race are the divine commands, and that whatever is opposed to them is error—is superstition—is an invention of ignorant men, whose class is opposed to the well-being and happiness of mankind, who are trained from their youth to deceive them, to fill them with fear and dread of nonentities, which they described according to the wildest fancies of the most absurd imagination.

None of this ignorant and mischievous proceeding will be found in the new state of existence. Nothing that is unknown, or that is incomprehensible to the human faculties, will create any other feeling than a cheerful confidence; that the best has been, is, and will be done, that the materials of which the universe is composed permit to be done.

Every aberration of the human intellects will be, at once, detected by the standard of truth, formed in every mind, of a sufficient number of facts, all in unison with each other.

This standard will guard the mind, in the new state of existence, against the reception of all incongruous notions and absurd combination of ideas. Superstitious and supernatural fears will entirely

cease, and all will readily acquire correct ideas relative to the decomposition of all materials, compounds, and organizations.

Were it not for the irrational, imaginary notions, which, for numberless ages, the population of the world has been compelled to receive as divine truths, there would be no fear of death among mankind.

It would become obvious that the materials of which the earth and atmosphere are composed, modified, as they probably are, by the influence of the solar system in which they revolve, are continually undergoing the changes of composition and decomposition according to the fixed laws of nature, which alter not their eternal course, in the slightest iota, through any of the forms or ceremonies, or wordy wanderings of the human race.

Are we not justified in saying that it is a necessary law, of all other laws of nature, that no change has ever been or can be made in the eternal laws of the universe? That the least change in the laws by which the universal mechanism and chemistry of nature perform their united operations, would create a chaos and confusion that would disturb and destroy its one universal movement that preserves the harmony of all existences?

Can these laws be rendered variable and uncertain for man, an insect upon an atom, as he exists upon the earth compared to the eternity of space, with its endless systems of suns and planets, revolving, sphere beyond sphere, unchanged and probably unchangable? No! the composition and decomposition upon the earth, when viewed without the vanity and presumption arising from ignorance of the laws of nature, will be found to differ not in man from any other vegetable or animal compound. He is composed of the self-same materials, and he is again decomposed, and becomes part of the general mass from which every earthly compound continues to be formed.

And this is a law of impartiality and justice, which, when it shall be fully comprehended, will lead, not only to universal charity in practice from man to man throughout the globe; but it will fill him with benevolent and kind feelings for all that has life—it will give him, in fact, a fellow-feeling for all that exists around him.

He will know that he is perpetually changing particles of his own existence with all objects among which he moves, whether animate or inanimate. He will, therefore, avoid giving unnecessary pain to anything that has life. The worm and the insect are his kinsfolk; they are from the same original stock of materials, and in the next decomposition will unite again as children of the same origin, proceeding from one common parent, who is alike interested in the general happiness of every being formed from the universal mass from whence all come, and into which all return.

No! man is not an exception to the general laws of nature; he is born and he dies, and "the place which knew him, knows him no more."

There is not one single fact, except in a slight extension of some of the same faculties, different in the formation and decomposition of man, from any other earthly compound and decomposition; and when man shall be disabused, on this subject, they will be great gainers in practice.

They will no longer vainly expend their time and faculties upon imaginary future existences which belong not to their nature; but they will at once apply themselves, heart and soul, to make a paradise of their present abode, that each generation in succession may enjoy it continually without any ignorant fears for the future, except that of creating some permanent cause of misery during their lives; such as slavery, cruel and unjust laws, or irrational institutions and customs, to inflict punishment on their progeny; or, in other words, on that which constituted part of themselves, and for which they would have, if rightly instructed, a fellow-feeling.

This view of our existence is similar to the desire we have been taught to have to provide abundantly for our children and immediate descendants.

The latter is now an ignorant and selfish desire, created by an artificial state of society, while the other will evince a true knowledge of human nature and generate dispositions of unbounded love and charity—not in words, but in practice, for the whole human race, present and future.

This view of human nature will put an end to the pride, vanity, and selfishness of individuals and families; it will destroy all notions of superstition and of unknown supernatural agencies, until some tangible and consistent facts respecting their existence, if they do exist, shall be acquired. And more especially of their interference in human affairs in opposition to the unerring laws of nature.

It will also annul all the unreasonable fears of death, or of our accidental or natural decomposition, which are now so unwisely instilled into the minds of children, almost as soon as they can be made to receive these injurious impressions. Man is thus made a mental coward, and filled with all manner of fears of the imagination, against which he knows not how to defend himself. He is thus made so weak and irrational, that he continually torments himself and others through life, without producing any counteracting benefit.

Instead of being thus abused in childhood, he ought to be taught from infancy the plain truth on this, as well as upon every other subject.

He would then know what to expect, and he would be always without fear or dread of any kind, prepared for that change which all nature undergoes; and his happiness, during life would not be disturbed with apprehensions and fears of what would become of him after decomposition.

He would comprehend the truth, upon this subject, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and in consequence, his mind would

be firm and sane at all times; he would be free to act, without a selfish motive, what the world now calls a noble and generous part to all his fellow-beings, but which conduct would then become the common practice of the human race.

NINTH CONDITION.

Of a state of society, in which all its laws, institutions, and customs shall be in accordance with the laws of human nature, or with the divine laws by which man is formed and governed.

Any society in which the laws of man have been made to oppose the divine laws of his nature, must, of necessity, exist in a state of continued crime, disunion, and misery.

All societies of men have been so formed, that at this day they all exist in crime, disunion, and misery. In all of them the divine laws of nature have been misunderstood, or disregarded, and men have busied themselves in vain, in devising artificial laws to alter their unchangeable nature, and improve the work of a power beyond their faculties to comprehend.

It is evidently the whole duty of man for his own sake, and for the benefit of his race, to find out the laws of his nature, that he may first know what manner of being he is, and then form all his institutions to be in strict accordance with these divine laws. He will then, by the natural progress of knowledge, bring about a new state of existence, in which the duty, the interest, and inclination of all will be, at all times, one and the same feeling. In which all will possess, in security, and without opposition from any quarter, a full supply, at all times, of whatever is essential to the happiness of human life.

Under the supposition that these principles are as true, and their practice as beneficial as I have stated, it becomes a question of permanent interest, to know how this change—a change greater than all which have preceded it—can be accomplished, not only without injury to any, but with permanent advantage to all. To me it appears that this change can be effected, the most easily, by the union, in the first instance, of some of the leading governments, and of the heads of the chief sects of religion, in the adoption of general measures to direct the new arrangements upon an extensive scale; but in a manner so gradual, that no shock shall be given to the interests or feelings of any portion of society. And, in forming these arrangements, no attempt should be permitted to be made to displace the individuals who are at the head, or who administer any of the existing governments.

No member of any church should be deprived, during his life, of the support and emoluments which he now derives from it. No one deriving his support from other professions should be in any degree curtailed in the advantages which he derives from his present station in them. No one employed in any business should be called upon, or expected to do more than his present occupation requires

him to perform. No one shall be required to do anything contrary to his former habits.

It is unnecessary that any of these evils should arise or be allowed to take place, because, there is power in society, which, when directed, will be found much more than sufficient to supply all the wants and wishes of mankind, without it being necessary to adopt any of these temporary evils, or in any degree to diminish the small portion of happiness, which under the existing systems, had fallen to the lot of any individual.

The unused and misdirected powers of society, are far more than sufficient to satisfy the wishes of all mankind, as soon as they shall learn what is requisite to make them happy ; and shall know what it is their interest to desire, and the best means to obtain and secure it.

Thus have I endeavord to sketch the outline of the causes of the past and present errors, and evils among men ; to deduce the principles of human nature from facts which change not, but which remain the "same yesterday, to-day, and forever ;" to show how those principles may be beneficially applied to practice, for the advantage of mankind, and how this change may be gradually effected throughout society without injury to any individual of any class, sect, party, or country.

MR. CAMPBELL'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—I did not know that in undertaking to encounter Mr. Owen with controversial weapons I was to combat with a *divinity*. I did not know that his twelve laws were to be received and interpreted as divine revelations. He has claimed the power of forgiving us and himself all sins originating in his own singular and eccentric course during the whole prosecution of this argument. He has laid claim to the high attribute of understanding the secrets of all hearts. He says that his facts and premises are of a dignity and high import that none of us are able to comprehend ; and seems to insinuate that there are as many mysteries and incomprehensibilities in the new revelation which he promulgates, as in the old one, which we have all been taught to receive.

But, with all due deference to Mr. Owen's new light of revelation, I must protest against the liberties which he takes with our oracles. He seems to be very fond of quoting from them. This must proceed either from a desire to mislead us by passing off these sentences as expressive of his meaning in the commonly received sense of them, or from his conviction that there is no book so eloquent and sublime as the Bible, and thus he directly compliments the book which he opposes.

I did expect, in this contest, to have had to encounter the much boasted reason of the skeptics. In their zealous adoration of reason, skeptics have ridiculed us as mere dupes for revering the light of the sacred volume. I did expect that argument, deduction, reason, proof, the most exact and philosophical definitions, and the most

minute analysis of the physical and intellectual man, would have been adduced by my opponent in this discussion. I was expecting to meet this formidable array of controversial forces; but to my utter astonishment, I have not yet been encountered by a single syllogism. So far, my opponent has offered us neither logical premises nor conclusions. Well, perhaps we must overlook all this, and anticipate a new order of things. I have regretted the necessity of introducing the argument which I have nearly brought to a close, because it is neither adapted to the taste nor apprehension of a popular assembly. But I have been obliged to be somewhat abstract in these disquisitions because the scope of the debate seems to require it, and the debate itself is contemplated to be matter of record. It is only after the whole premises are submitted to calm and dispassionate reading, that you can form a correct estimate of the validity of each argument. I should, therefore, never have thought of introducing an argument of this abstract character before this assembly, did I not expect the whole to be published, and the grounds on which the cause of eternal truth is to be placed against the fancies and cavils of distempered minds, fairly laid before the youth of this generation.

In introducing an argument like this in a popular assembly, we have to imitate the pedagogue who first teaches the alphabet in order to give his pupil the art of reading. We have to adduce the alphabet of mental philosophy in order to lead you to relish and apprehend the truth of our reasonings upon our external senses and mental faculties. But in purely abstract and philosophic topics this course must be pursued. I must, then, go over the ground which I have taken in this argument, so far as it has been prosecuted, with the hope that if Mr. Owen will not take notice of any issue that may be tendered to him, some other person may present me with some solid objections, in order that these premises may be tested thoroughly by fair and logical arguments. We have, then, endeavored to show by a very brief analysis of our senses, that we can have no simple ideas except those derived through sensation and reflection; that the powers of the mind in all its operations are confined to ideas and impressions, acquired by perception and consciousness, that although we may compound and remodify almost *ad infinitum*, we cannot originate an idea entirely new. We have shown that speech is neither natural to man, nor the invention of man; that infants must be *taught* to speak by a slow and regular process; that names are applied to things and ideas in consequence of the pre-existence of the ideas in the mind; that the idea must always necessarily precede the name, and that we have experimental proof from infants, from those born deaf and subsequently restored to hearing. And here I will remark, for the sake of illustration, that no infant has ever been known to speak any language but that which it has been taught, nor to attempt to give a name to anything till some mother, nurse, or other instructor, has designated that thing by its appropriate name

to the child. I have stated that it was universally known that a man born deaf could never be taught to speak until his deafness was removed, because the power of speech can only be acquired by the ear, and not by any other organ; that if it were natural to man to express himself in language, and give names to ideas and sensible objects, all men would attempt this, the untaught, as well as those who have been taught to speak. In the philosophical transactions of several European and American societies there are instances on record of persons born deaf, being brought to hearing after they had attained the age of twenty-five or thirty, and then taught the use of speech. These persons have been interrogated whether, previously to their restoration to the faculty of hearing, and their acquisition of the power of speech, they had ever, from their observations on the visible universe, derived any idea of an invisible Creator; and, with one voice, they have declared that such an idea never entered their imaginations. This tangible fact is to be found in the records of all the cases in which this cure has been performed.

This is the only experiment that is possible to make in a case of this kind; for we cannot find a human being possessed of a full organization, whose mind has not in some way or other been enlightened on this subject by tradition. We cannot find a man perfectly in a state of nature, who never heard the sound of any human voice but his own. If we could, he might be a fit subject to experiment upon, after teaching him the use of speech. This is all the proof that the nature of the argument requires or directs, and it must be by this time logically established in the minds of those who can appreciate the argument. It has been presumed that we might arrive at the idea of a first cause by a process of reasoning *à posteriori;* but there is a palpable *petitio principii* in this argument, since it assumes that the material world is an effect, and if an effect it must have a *cause*, which is the very position to be proved. So far reason and experience correspond with revelation. I rest a very important point of the argument here—for if this be argument and not fallacy, (and I wish to hear all objections to the argument), then Paul's was an axiomatic truth: "By *faith* we understand that the universe was made by the word of God." He does not say by *reason*, observe, but by *faith*. No christian can demur to a mode of reasoning which has for its object the establishing a conviction of the truth of what Paul says, when he affirms that *by faith we know the universe was made by the word of God*, when he affirms that *the world by philosophy never knew God*. Thirdly, we have further proved from the analysis of our intellectual powers, that faith or belief is not more necessary or independent of our volition than knowledge and experience. This is a very capital point of the argument, and goes to subvert the whole of my opponent's theory of faith. Faith, then, I say, has been proved to be as dependent on volition as knowledge or experience; because all the faculties employed in examining evidence and acquiring knowledge are subject to our volitions. The moment I determine

to push my investigation into any department of knowledge of which I am ignorant, that moment I summon my energies to the work. The moment testimony is presented to me, I call all my faculties to the examination of that testimony; and my volition is just as operative in my examination of testimony, as it is in my researches into any favorite department of science. Such then is the argument which I have submitted to you as deduced from these premises. We may now naturally lead you as we proposed, to the direct evidences of the positive truth of revelation, a duty which I hoped to have been called to at the onset.

My friend and I have been sailing in company so long, and have at last arrived where we can bring our artillery to bear against each other. I have just now arrived at the point upon which I did suppose all the merits of this controversy were to rest. But while speaking on the incapacity of the human mind to originate ideas entirely new, I cannot pretermit this opportunity of illustrating a theory, common, I believe, to both christians and skeptics, by a reference to my friend's proceedings. We have, then, asserted that the human faculties have not the power of originating anything new, and Mr. Owen's social theory corroborates the assertion. I would, therefore, ask Mr. Owen to answer this question, Did he, or did he not, some forty years ago, originate this theory from his own observation of human nature; or was it not suggested to him by the circumstances which christianity threw around him in Scotland? That his theory originated in the religious circumstances at that time existing in Lanark, we have good reason to believe. It was the christian benevolence of Mr. Dale which prompted him to invent a plan for the education of the children of the poor. By instituting a system of co-operation, Mr. Dale was enabled to sustain five hundred poor children at one time, who were collected in the manufactories, which he controlled, and were there maintained and educated by his philanthropy. And to these circumstances, instituted by Mr. Dale, is Mr. Owen indebted for the origination of his new views of society. And this is another proof that we can only acquire the knowledge of new things from things already known.

We come now, in the regular prosecution of this subject, to the consideration of an innate power in human nature. I do not know that I am able to designate this power by its appropriate name; but there is a native, inherent power in human nature of believing upon testimony. This power is sometimes called *credulity*, which is as inherent in the infant mind as any other faculty. Now, upon this credulity, are founded all systems of instruction. Were it not for this innate principle of credulity in human nature, there could be no docility in children. Were it not that they have the power of receiving instruction upon testimony from their teachers, all intellectual improbability would be impracticable. And here commences the line of demarcation between mere animal instinct and the intellectual progressiveness of man. He is by nature a progressive

animal, and there is no limit to his intellectual progress. But all this boundless improvability in man has its source in his credulity. If he had not the power of believing what his parents and all others who may stand in a didactic relation to him, instruct him in, it would be as impossible to fructify his mind, as it would be to teach a goat to speak. This power, by whatever name it may be called, is, in its operations, the most gigantic moral power with which man has been endowed. Now, the theory of my opponent pretermits and keeps out of view this important faculty of human nature; he has not founded a single one of his facts upon it. Nay, he has had the temerity to affirm that the only use of authority was to give countenance and support to that which was false and erroneous. I believe my friend volunteered this eccentric affirmative proposition, because he was well aware that the faculty of believing or disbelieving the verity of facts as reported, is the principal germ of improvability in man. To this fact are we indebted for almost all we know. If Mr. Owen could erase from the tablet of his mind all that he has acquired upon the testimony of others—if it were possible for him to be deprived of a native inherent faculty, which is *inalienable* from his nature, and to be made dependent for his acquisitions of knowledge exclusively upon his own observation and experience, he would not have one idea for ten thousand which he now has, and for which he is indebted to his power of belief upon testimony. Here is no exaggeration. If the difference could be computed, it is probable I should be found to have fallen short of the mark. There is not a savage "running wild in the woods," untutored and untamed, who does not owe more of his information to the faculty of receiving truth upon testimony, than to all the experience of his life multiplied by thousands. What is the legitimate import of the term *experience? Experience* is neither more nor less than another name for memory.

Suppose I should, by some accident, some concussion of the brain, be deprived of the faculty of *memory*, what would my *experience* be worth after I had forgotten all that I had ever heard, seen, read, or acted? And yet this experience is the mighty engine by which my friend expects to overturn everything founded on testimony!!*

---

*While reading over my debate with Mr. Owen, which I see is a good deal in the style of my extemporaneous harangues—a good many unnecessary repetitions, and a too great diffuseness in the argument, (though I hope this defect will be advantageous to the common reader as it will keep the argument longer before his mind, and relieve him from much abstract thinking), I discover what I call a more forcible proof of the argument against the *deistical* notion of *natural* religion, or the supposed power we have to originate the idea of God, spirit, angels, heaven, a future state, etc. I gave one forcible proof, as I think, in merely asking Mr. Owen to originate the idea of a *sixth sense*. This, I think, is an irresistible proof, that the human mind, however cultivated, has not the power of originating an idea entirely new. But perhaps the following puzzle will carry conviction farther and deeper than any argument yet adduced upon this subject.

We know *three* worlds—one by sense, and two by faith—I say we are in possession of *ideas* concerning three worlds; the present material world, pos-

MR. OWEN'S FOURTEENTH ADDRESS.

I wish to have the official copy of the points of debate, that I may adhere strictly to them.

[*Mr. Campbell hands the document to Mr. Owen.*]

My friends, I deem it the first duty of those who are contending only for the truth, to concede everything they possible can to an opponent. I therefore most readily concede to Mr. Campbell that the christian religion was the foundation of the social system. When I was very young I was very religious. At seven, eight, nine, and up to ten years of age, I only read what are called *good* books. But at ten years of age I became convinced, from these books, that there was error somewhere. I discovered so much contradiction between different religions, and between the various sects of the same religion, that I became convinced there was some great error pervading the whole subject. I was very desirous to distinguish truth from error, and studied, with great industry, for the three following years, that is, until I was thirteen years old, with a determination, forced upon me by my early impressions, to find, if possible, a religion that was true. But the more I read and reflected, the more errors and mistakes I discovered in religion, and, therefore, the more I differed from christianity and all other religions; until, at length, I was compelled, sorely against my will, to believe christianity and all religions

---

sessing, as we now think, various combinations of forty elements. This is the mundane system. The other two worlds are *Heaven* and *Hell*, or a state of future bliss, and future woe. Beside these, from some expressions found in the scriptures, concerning the intermediate state from death to the resurrection, some have fancied a state called *Purgatory*. This is, however, only in part fanciful, because there is a state of separation of spirit and body, which was the data for this idea. But now, I ask all the atheists and skeptics, of every name, to fancy any other world—a fourth world—and to give us a single idea of it, not borrowed, in whole or in part, from the three already known. If, with all the intellect, which science and philosophy have given them, they cannot do this, how, in the name of common sense, can they say that savages, when they had but this globe, or a knowledge of one world, could originate two others? If but two worlds, Earth and Heaven, had yet been known, without revelation, it would have been just as difficult to have originated a third, as it is now to originate a fourth. If then, any skeptic, deist, or atheist, in these United States, will tell me what a sixth sense or a fourth world would be, I will then concede that this philosophic argument is not conclusive; till then I must think that it is—till then I must think that it exterminates every system of skepticism in the world. Here I must retort upon all atheists in a way which their own system teaches me. You, gentlemen, deny that there is what we call a Creator, and that you are creatures. But, in truth, you give to man all the powers we give to God; you believe and teach that we christians have created two worlds out of nothing, and filled them with inhabitants. The atheists, for their bodies and *souls* (if they have any), cannot get along with their own system without a *creator*. They give to christians all the attributes which christians give to God. They say that we christians have *created two worlds* out of nothing, and have filled them with inhabitants, by the mere strength of our omnipotent imagination!! If this be not good logic, on their premises, I will consent to go to school again. Will some of the club show us that the conclusion is illogical?

to be founded in error. There was no relation, no congruity between them and facts—between what they taught, and what I knew and felt to be true.

Therefore, Mr. Campbell's surmise that the christian religion was the foundation of this system is perfectly correct; but it was not founded in the *truth* of the christian religion.

Finding that no religion was based upon facts, but that all of them were in opposition to facts, and could not therefore be true, I began to reflect upon what must be the condition of mankind, trained from infancy to believe in these errors, and to make them the rule of their conduct. I argued thus with myself: As I am very certain that religion is not true, therefore something else must be true, and it is highly important to discover what it is. With a view to this discovery I read five hours per day for twenty-five years, until I believe I collected all the facts which are of value on these subjects, in the English language, during a great part of the latter period, exclusively under the influence of an earnest, honest, ardent desire to discover and elicit the truth. I knew that there were certain facts and deductions from them, upon which all parties were agreed. I thought it, therefore, highly probable that those points on which all parties had agreed were true; and these I recollected for the sake of reference and comparison. But when I came to an idea that was not in unison or accordance with them, I felt myself, as a lover of truth, bound to examine it carefully, because I very early discovered that truth was always consistent with itself. If, therefore, I found, by close investigation and extensive comparison, that the new idea to be examined was in strict consistency and congruity with the other truths previously received into my mind, it was added to the original store. And thus I went on with great diligence and perseverance, until I had collected a great stock of ideas, all in unison with each other. And it is from this stock of ideas, and from no other source, that I have been enabled to discover the ignorance in which we and our ancestors have been trained. I did not go into Scotland until seventeen years after my mind had passed through the greater part of this process. I was a thorough skeptic for seventeen years before my removal to Scotland. In regard to Mr. Dale, there never was, perhaps, a man of kinder or more benevolent feelings. After I was his son-in-law we became very intimately acquainted with each other's real views and feelings. Our objects were precisely the same; but, by the difference of our organization and circumstances, we were compelled to take different roads to obtain them. I admired his character and conduct, and I believe he had a great regard and affection for me; for, in his last illness, he was desirous to receive his medicine and chief attendance from me, although he well knew how much I differed from him on the subject of religion, and although he had a number of religious friends about him. But this is a digression produced by Mr. Campbell's observations.

My organization, no doubt, differs in some degree from others; and certainly the circumstances which have acted upon that organization have been most peculiar. I do not know to what extent my organization differs from others; but the circumstances in which I have been placed, acting upon this organization, have been the causes which have produced all the occurrences and proceedings of my life, and my character and conduct, such as it has always been, before the world.

But to come to the point. I have stated that there are twelve fundamental laws of nature not derived from any authority whatever, but from facts which I defy all the world to disprove. Mr. Campbell admits that these facts are true, but contends that they do not contravene or oppose the faith and doctrine of christianity. Well, if my friend can convince me that there is no contradiction or discrepancy between these twelve laws and christianity, I shall then become a christian indeed. But to me, with such ability as I possess—with all the power of attention and discrimination which I can exercise on the subject, no two things ever did appear more strongly contrasted and opposed to each other than these twelve laws and christianity—to me they appear to be perfect antipodes to each other. If my friend Mr. Campbell can reconcile them, it is more than I can do. I shall listen with patience and great interest to the proofs which he may adduce on this point; because if he can prove that there exists no discrepancy between the two systems, he necessarily will make me a christian. My present conviction is, that these twelve laws of human nature differ, *toto cælo*, from christianity; that these twelve laws demonstrate, in the clearest manner, that all the religions of the world are founded in the ignorance of man with regard to himself; that all the religions of the world are therefore, Mr. Campbell [*turning round to him*], directly opposed to the never-changing laws of our nature; that there is not the remotest connection or affinity between these twelve laws and any religion existing on the face of the globe; that, on the contrary, all religions are in direct opposition to them; that these laws, when rightly understood, and fully and fairly carried into practice, will produce "peace on earth and good-will to man;" will create a new state of society, in which every individual composing it shall be simple and virtuous in his habits, highly intelligent, possessing the best dispositions, and enjoying the highest degree of human felicity.

I do say farther, that these religions are now the only obstacles which oppose themselves to the formation of a society over the earth of virtue, intelligence, and charity in its most extensive sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family. These are my general deductions from the premises before us. Were I to go into all the detail, I fear I should occupy too much of your time; for I have as much of these details to bring forward as would occupy your time for a fortnight, were I alone to speak. These details all go to show, step by step, throughout their whole

progress, how injurious all your religions are to yourselves—that they cause you and your children to continue, like your ancestors, in total ignorance of yourselves, and that they involve you in every kind of disunion, which generates the worst feelings and passions, and creates all those little under-currents of misery with which we are all but too familiar.

But we shall now bring this discussion within a narrow compass. I have stated these twelve laws as succinctly and distinctly as words for that purpose occur to me. Now, if Mr. Campbell will only show me that one, or all, or any, or either of these laws are contrary to fact, or in unison with christianity—from that time forth he makes me a christian!

Now, it will be Mr. Campbell's duty to prove either that these twelve laws of human nature are not derived from facts, and in unison therewith, or he must prove that these laws and christianity are one and indivisible. I take it for granted that Mr. Campbell gives up all other religions except the christian. But were I to go to any other country with my challenge, I could find no champion willing to defend any but his own; therefore, I can only be met formidably by the religion of the region or district where they happen to be. I should be told in one district, "We will not contend with you for the truth of the religion taught by Confucius, by Moses, or by Mahomet; but we will contend with you to the death for the divine truth of that holy religion which has been delivered to us of this district and to our fathers from time immemorial." The attachment of the inhabitants of the different regions of the earth to their respective religions seems to be but a mere local kind of attachment. When asked why they believe their peculiar religion to be the only true one, they reply, "Because we have been born in this part of the world, and have been taught that we ought so to believe." At present I shall say no more, having placed the matter thus plainly before you. Mr. Campbell has now a fair opportunity to prove that these twelve laws are not based upon facts, or being founded in truth, that they are in unison with christianity. I do not think it would be unfair to ask Mr. Campbell to proceed forthwith in reply to the mass of matter which has been presented; that I ought to put my document into his hands and allow him ample time to digest and refute it. Mr. Campbell has now either to lose his cause altogether, or to make me a christian.

In reply to a dictum *from the Chair, Mr. Owen said—*

I willingly adopt the suggestion from the chair, and shall proceed to-morrow to demonstrate the opposition between christianity and these facts, although Mr. Campbell ought, as he engaged, to show their accordance with each other.

MR. CAMPBELL'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.

I am glad there is now a probability of coming to close quarters with my friend and opponent.

[*Here the Honorable Chairman rose and stated, the impression of the Board to be, that the affirmative of the proposition now in debate rests with Mr. Owen. Unless he make out the affirmative, that his facts are irreconcileable to the christian religion, he fails to establish his proposition. The bare proof or admission of the twelve facts by no means establishes the proposition of Mr. Owen. It is one thing to lay down facts and prove them to be true, and another thing to ascertain the legitimate results from these facts. Mr. Owen succeeds but in part when he proves his facts. If the argument were to be suspended, Mr. Owen's proposition would not be sustained. Holding the affirmative of the proposition, Mr. Owen's* onus probandi *is not only to show that his facts are true, but that they are irreconcilable to christianity, and all other religions assumed to be veritable systems.*]

Mr. *Owen* rises—Mr. Chairman: I accord with this view of the Board, and shall proceed to-morrow to demonstrate the discrepancies between christianity and these twelve facts.

Mr. *Campbell* rises again—Mr. Chairman: In the meantime I ask to be indulged with permission to prosecute the argument which I have thus far introduced. When I sat down I had got to the position that all the experience of man amounted to no more than his memory; but this is to be understood *sub modo*. When I defined experience thus, I meant to exclude every particle of knowledge derived from faith in testimony. I meant *personal* experience in the strictest sense, and had reference only to the precise *quantum* of information to be acquired by *individuality* of experience. But as we have advanced thus far toward the true point on which christianity is founded, I deem it important to aid my opponent by adducing facts, additional to his twelve, in evidence of the verity of the christian religion. I require the concession of only one postulatum in order to establish the verity of the christian religion. That postulate I will couch in the following terms—The christian religion, as well as the Jewish, is founded upon certain matters of fact—or rather, these religions being founded upon certain matters of fact, it follows that, if these facts be true, the whole system of the christian religion must be true. Well, then, my postulate is, that the christian religion, as well as the Jewish, being founded upon matters of fact, it follows, logically, that, if these facts are proved to be true, the religions founded upon them are thereby demonstrated to be equally true. In producing our deductions concerning the truth of christianity, it is necessary first of all to have respect to the Jewish religion. This is not an inquiry into any matter of abstract, or philosophical, or mathematical, or political speculation. The seven sciences have nothing at all to do with it. The subject of inquiry is now, What is or is not *matter of fact?* We are fully warranted in premising that the question concerning the verity of christianity is exclusively a question of fact, to be tried by all the rules of evidence which govern our decision upon any question of historical fact derived from times of equal antiquity. We contend

that every faculty of mind, and every mode of reasoning that can be brought to bear upon any question of fact, may be legitimately exercised upon all the facts connected with the christian religion. Let us then adduce these facts.

In the first place it is recorded that in the days of Moses the children of Israel amounted to six hundred thousand fighting men exclusive of the old men, the females, and the children; most probably the whole Jewish population at that period did not fall short of two millions. At any rate, we have the fact that six hundred thousand fighting men passed out of Egypt and walked through the Red Sea; that they reached Mount Sinai; that there they saw a visible manifestation of Deity; that they heard his voice proclaim the decalogue; that they were fed with *manna* in the wilderness for forty years; that they had a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, to guide them through the wilderness; that they were fed with quails, and drank limpid water from a rock of flint, smitten by the rod of Moses; and that they passed through the river Jordan as over dry land. These are the matters of fact which constitute the foundation of the Jewish religion. And these being proved to be matters of fact, it follows that the religion founded upon them is true. I presume that my friend and opponent would admit that if it were proved to him that these six hundred thousand men passed through the Red Sea as over dry land—heard the voice of God, and witnessed the awful symbols of his presence from Mount Sinai—that they gathered *manna* in the wilderness—drank the living water which issued from the rock smitten by the rod of Moses—passed through the refluent waters of Jordan—I presume, I say, that all these things being proved to my opponent to be facts, he would admit, without scruple, that the religion built upon them is *true*.

Now, I do assert that of the verity of these facts we have every species of evidence that human reason requires, that the most skeptical mind could require upon any other subject of equal antiquity, or that the nature of the case permits to be adduced in attestation of the verity of ancient historic facts. I have asserted that we have every species of evidence of the verity of these facts, and of this religion, that right reason requires. In order to prove these facts, we must lay down certain *criteria* by which we are enabled to decide with certainty upon all questions of historic fact. In the first place, then, you will observe that we have certain *criteria* by which we are enabled to discriminate between the truth and fallacy of testimony; and it is our every-day practice, in the ordinary concerns of life, to avail ourselves of these *criteria*. We do not believe everything without scruple. We are often glad of the opportunity of examining oral and written testimony, and we generally find some way to elicit the truth, or detect the fallacy of certain reported facts. These *criteria*, when applied to any reported fact, force us to the conclusion that it is either true or false. Were it not for these *criteria*, by which we are enabled to appreciate the value of testimony,

we would, in the ordinary course of society, be liable to constant deceptions, inasmuch as the conscientious speaking of the truth is not the distinguishing virtue of the present age. These *criteria* are various; but wherever there is a perfect consistency and accordance between the fact reported and the testimony, adduced to prove it, conviction of the verity of that fact necessarily follows. In the first place the consistency of the testimony, with our present experience in matters of this sort, is a safe *criteria* whereby to test the verity of all matters of ordinary occurrence, *i. e.*, taken in connection with the character of the reporter, and all the other *media* through which we receive the testimony. All these are scrutinized in order to ascertain the truth in ordinary cases; but to facts incrusted with the venerable rust of antiquity—a rust which has been accumulating for four thousand years—the application of the ordinary *criteria* of more recent facts would be futile.

The *desideratum* is to establish certain *criteria* which will satisfactorily demonstrate that facts reported to have occurred four thousand years ago are true. And these *criteria* I now propose to present to you—not the *criteria* of facts which occurred yesterday, or to-day; but of facts which transpired four thousand years ago. These *criteria*, then, are resolvable into four particulars. (And, by the way, we wish any defect or imperfection in these *criteria* to be designated by any person who can discover it.) First, then, we allege, that, in order to judge with certainty of the truth of facts which occurred so long ago, the facts reported must have been what we call *sensible* facts; such as the eyes of the spectators, and all their other senses might take cognizance of. Secondly, that these sensible alleged facts were exhibited with every imaginable *public and popular attestation*, and open to the severest scrutiny which their extraordinary character might induce. The facts we are now testing by these two *criteria*, were, I affirm, in the first place, *sensible* facts; and secondly, they were exhibited under circumstances of *extraordinary publicity*. Thirdly, that there have been certain monumental and commemorative *institutions*, continuing from that time to the present, as a perpetual attestation of these facts—that each of these observances was instituted in *perpetuam memoriam rei*. Fourthly, that these monumental proofs existed simultaneously with the transpiration of the facts which they are intended to perpetuate—that they continue in existence up to the present hour:

1. The facts relied upon were sensible facts.
2. They were facts of remarkable notoriety.
3. There now exist standing monuments in perpetual commemoration of these facts.

Lastly, These commemorative attestations have continued from the very period in which the facts transpired, up to the present time. The facts on which we rely have all these four criteria. I am willing to submit them to all the tests which can be applied to any other recorded facts of antiquity. And I repeat, with a confidence that

fears no refutation, that no fact accompanied with these *four* criteria ever was proved to be false. Nay, we will demonstrate that no fact which can abide these *criteria* CAN be false.

Let us now come to the prominent facts on which the Jewish religion was first founded. 1st. I have stated that six hundred thousand men are said to have walked through the Red Sea as over dry land, in consequence of Moses' rod being extended over it; they are said to have stood still upon the opposite shore, while the Egyptians, their pursuers, were drowned by the returning of the waters. The question is, Was this a sensible fact? We will say nothing at present concerning the ten plagues of Egypt, but will now advert to another fact intimately connected with this subject. On the night immediately preceding the departure of the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, it became necessary, before the hard heart of Pharaoh would relent so far as to let these people go, to send forth a destroying angel, by whom the first-born of the land were slain. This was, most certainly, a sensible fact, of such paramount and engrossing interest as to arouse every sense, and call forth every faculty in the thorough investigation of it. These two facts, to pass over all others, are of the character promised. They are not only sensible facts, but they are facts of a character to take hold of, and to make an indelible impression upon, every faculty and sense belonging to mankind. Well, now, so far these facts correspond with our first criterion. The next question is, Were they publicly exhibited in open day and in the face of witnesses? I only propose this question in order to fix your attention. Every man who has heard of these facts, knows that they were exhibited in the face of the most enlightened realm of antiquity, many of them in the very court of Pharaoh, which was crowded with the greatest statesmen and scholars that then existed. The people to be delivered were themselves six hundred thousand in number, each of them individually and deeply interested; so that all the recollections connected with their state of vassalage; all their national feelings of hostility toward their oppressors; in short, every sort of feeling which belongs to man, was called into exercise to the very highest degree of excitement; and all these concurring to impress their minds indelibly with the marvelous and stupendous character of the fact. Therefore, there is no matter of fact on record more notorious than these. In like manner, the eating of the *manna* and drinking of the waters from the rock are sensible facts, and in their nature must have been most notorious. In them all there is not a single matter of fact on which the Jewish religion is founded that is not in its nature sensible and notorious.

We next ask, Are there any commemorative institutions now existing in attestation of these facts? Yes, for the whole Jewish nation exists at this day. Notwithstanding all the mighty empires of antiquity, which once flourished in history, and in their turns controlled the temporal destinies of the world, have sunk, one after

another, into dust—have so crumbled to atoms, as to leave no trace behind them—not even a living man, who can say one drop of Grecian or Roman blood flows in his veins—one nation, one *monumental* nation of antiquity, yet remains—a nation who can trace their lineage up to its source—a monumental nation, with monumental institutions, which prove them to be the legitimate seed of Abraham, and which stamp the seal of verity upon the historic facts recorded of this people. Do not their circumcision and their passover still exist?

We have now applied three of our *criteria* in attestation of the facts relied upon. The fourth is, that the commemorative monuments instituted simultaneously with the transpiration of the facts to be preserved and perpetuated, have never been out of existence from that period up to the present hour. Moses tells them, on the very night preceding their departure from the land of Egypt, to take a lamb, to be called the Paschal Lamb, and to dress and eat it in a peculiar manner. This festival was to be observed on that night, and under circumstances calculated, on every return of its anniversary, to excite the recollections and the feelings of the Jewish nation. He tells them that they must, on every anniversary of this festival, eat the passover with a strict observance of all rites and circumstances; that they must eat with their loins girded, and with such other adjuncts as should remind them of the sorrows of their captivity in Egypt. Now we are able to show that there never has been an interval from that period down to the present, in which the anniversary of the feast of the *passover* has not been solemnly celebrated. This feast was instituted on that memorable night, and has continued unchanged down to the present period. But this is only an item of the monumental evidences of historic truth pervading the singular annals of this most interesting people. This signal deliverance from the house of bondage is commemorated by institutions attended with such peculiar adjuncts as entwine themselves around the hearts of men—adjuncts, which, in the very act of commemorating, call into exercise all the feelings incident to human nature. Of this character is the institution which devotes the first-born of the land to the Lord.

The Jews were not permitted to consider their first-born as their own, but as belonging to the Lord, as given to him in memory of their redemption from the house of bondage. It is now not simply the passover which commemorates the fact of deliverance from the land of Egypt, but this separation and appropriation of the first-born of the land to the Lord perpetuates the fact. This devotion of the first-born to the Lord is calculated in its nature to engross the whole heart of man. Men are not to be persuaded to part with their children, or their substance, except by the most cogent reasons. These people, proverbially avaricious, not only observed the passover, but resigned all property in the first-born of the land to the Lord. In process of time, when the nation was brought into a state of muni-

cipal order, and under a national covenant, it was then so ordered that one tribe was selected to be given to the Lord in lieu of the first-born. And here we see the whole nation agreeing to support that tribe forever. This selection was made from the tribe of Levi. To superficial observers the ingenuity displayed in the erection of this monument in perpetuation of the memory of a leading fact in Jewish history, may not appear; but it is a monumental institution, eminently calculated in its nature to keep the recollection of the fact which it commemorates fresh and vivid in the hearts and minds of the Israelites. The whole number at that time of the first-born of the whole twelve tribes was twenty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-three. Moses was commanded to calculate the number of the tribe of Levi, which was twenty-two thousand. The whole tribe of Levi was taken, head for head; and the two hundred and seventy-three of the first-born, over and above, were redeemed at five shekels per head. Observe the exactitude and particularity of this arrangement. First, the institution of the passover; next, the segregation of the first-born of the land as the Lord's; and after this an arrangement to appropriate the whole tribe of Levi—two hundred and seventy-three lacking in number were to be redeemed at one hundred *oboli* apiece.

Thus the avarice, the gratitude, and every other passion of the Jewish nation, were made to co-operate in attestation and perpetuation of this leading fact. Here we may remark, that as these sensible demonstrations, and the very manner of their exhibition, exclude the possibility of imposition upon the minds and senses of the first actors and original witnesses of these facts; so the *criteria* of these monumental and commemorative facts equally preclude the possibility of imposition upon us. Let us dwell for a moment upon the influence of this commemorative institution of the passover, and the conventional segregation of an entire tribe to be supported forever by the great body of the people—a tribe who were to have cities built for them—who were made proprietors of all the circumjacent lands, and who were exonerated by the new social compact of the nation from all personal care and anxiety concerning their own support. The tribe of Levi, and all their personal property, were segregated to the service of the Lord. This was a concession demanded of this people as a condition precedent to their enjoyment of the new national covenant. And thus has divine wisdom perpetuated a standing monument in commemoration of the miracles of Moses. To bring this matter home to every man's business and bosom, I would ask all of you if it would be possible to induce you to sanctify and segregate one child of your family, or one lamb of your fold, or to celebrate a certain annual festival in commemoration of a fact which never occurred? Does the widest range of human experience warrant the supposition that any people, under any circumstances, could be induced to do this?

We are now to try this matter by the tests of reason, and to

examine whether it were possible, in the first instance, to fabricate these monumental evidences. Let us ask ourselves seriously if any nation under heaven could be induced to celebrate a solemn annual festival in commemoration of a false fact—a fact which never did occur? Could all the magi, sorcerers, and wonder-mongers of eastern antiquity, if they were now alive, compel the North American nation to observe the first day of January in commemoration of their declaration of independence, when the whole nation knew that its anniversary was the fourth day of July? To suppose such an absurdity as this—to admit for a moment the possibility of such a national extravagance—is to suppose men to be very differently constituted now-a-days from what all former experience has ever demonstrated them to be.

If these mighty miracles of Moses had been performed in a dark corner of the earth, in the presence of only a few wandering tribes, or of a rude, unlettered nation, without records, some skeptical scruples might arise in our minds. But the Most High has so contrived it as to leave no room for any cavil of this nature.

These facts transpired in an age when the human faculties were highly cultivated; Moses himself was brought up in all the learning of the Egyptians, a nation at that period pre-eminently distinguished for scientific acquirements. Who is not acquainted with the scientific reputation of ancient Egypt? Who has not heard of her proficiency in the arts, particularly in the art of embalming, of which we are ignorant? Standing monuments of the scientific attainments and luxurious refinement of this people abound at the present day. From their own annals it appears that they were quite as skeptical as the people of the present day. Here I will take occasion to remark that the facts on which the Jewish and christian religions have been founded, have been wisely arranged so as to transpire in the presence of nations as bold, daring, politic, ambitious, and intelligent as ourselves. We are wont to think slightly, and to speak disparagingly of the intellectual powers of the ancients. But there were a great many highly polished and severely disciplined minds among them. And it was in the presence of such a people, shrewd, keen, and skeptical—in their metropolis, within the precincts of the court, in the face of kings, courtiers, sages, and statesmen—that these evidences were adduced, these miracles were wrought, and these monumental commemorative institutions were erected. Everything was so ordered in relation to these facts, as to remove forever all rational ground of doubt or skepticism. So far, then, I have proceeded to give a general idea of the argument which I am now to submit in attestation of the facts on which the Jewish religion is founded.

In the further prosecution of the argument, we shall illustrate other facts analogous to the preceding, embracing similar objects, and, like them, perpetuated by monumental commemorative institutions. We shall briefly analyze the institution of the Sabbath, the

celebration of the passover, and other festivals of the Jewish ritual. To support these monumental commemorative institutions a levy became necessary to a greater amount than ever was exacted by the fiscal polity of any other nation; and such was the veneration of this people for their ritual, that this enormous taxation was submitted to without a murmur. I have been calculating the amount of property necessary to the support of the Jewish religion, and have elaborated this result: that one half of the time and money, a full moiety of the whole resources of the nation, was exacted; and one chief object was to keep these miracles, with their monumental attestations, in perpetual remembrance. The cheerful relinquishment of one half their whole personal property goes to repudiate the idea that this people were cajoled by intrigue into submission to such an oppressive taxation. We shall further show that all the other facts on which religion is founded have been accompanied with the same commemorative and perpetuating attestations from the moment of their transpiration down to our present times.*

MR. OWEN'S FIFTEENTH ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman—I do not discover anything in my friend, Mr. Campbell's, last address, that requires an immediate reply. I shall, therefore, proceed further to demonstrate, from my manuscript, the ignorance which has pervaded the world up to the present time. I had proceeded to the sixth law when my half hour expired. I now come to the seventh. [*Here Mr. Owen begins to read, commencing on the subject of the ascertainment of the standard number of individuals to be congregated in social union, so as to give to each the greatest advantages with the fewest inconveniences*].

[*Mr. Owen reads to the fifteenth law, and here remarks*]:—

And, therefore, there will be no selection or election to office, and ever one at an early age will discover that at the proper period of life he will have an equal right with all, to be in possession of his full and fair share of the government of society; there will be no electioneering artifices; no detraction of private character; no jarring of interests, or collision about the distribution of office.

[*Mr. Owen gets to the twenty-third law, and here he remarks*]:—

You will observe, my friends, that, by these arrangements, we

* We have found some difficulty in ascertaining exactly how much of Mr. Owen's manuscript was read at each time during this day. The reporter generally states the page on which Mr. Owen began and ended; but in one or two cases this was omitted, or so ambiguously done, that we are not certain that we have, in every instance, given the exact amount read. Another difficulty was, that some remarks interspersed with these readings were difficult to place in their proper places. None of these difficulties, however, in the least affected the argument. But as there were a few remarks which were not ushered in their proper places, we shall give them here, that every word of the report of Mr. Owen's speeches may be published. These remarks were made somewhere while Mr. Owen was reading his code of laws. We put the numbers of the laws under which we suppose these remarks were made.—Ed.

shall save the enormous waste of time and money to which religion now subjects us, and we shall be relieved from the still more enormous expense of all its vice and injustice.

[*Mr. Owen reads to the twenty-fifth law, and observes*]:—

These, my friends, will make in our new state of existence, just twenty-seven laws, very plain and easily to be understood, and most effectual for all the purposes of society. You will presently learn that truth is always simple; that there is so much more harmony, unison, and consistency in all its parts, that there can be no difficulty in comprehending and acting upon it.

When we remove the priests, lawyers, warriors, merchants, etc. what a happy state of society shall we enjoy! None of us shall have occasion to be employed more than two hours per day; yet we shall all have an abundance of the best of everything! I now proceed to the Appendix, which is the last part of the subject I have written out; and this additional explanation is only for the sake of a more full development of the subject. I have merely glanced at the nine requisites for happiness—it would require too much of your time to proceed to its extent. Can any of you, my friends, form an idea of anything necessary for human happiness beyond these nine conditions? All I can say on this part of the subject, is, that my mind has not been able to discover anything for the heart of man to desire, beyond what these arrangements provide, and for what, if consummated, they must secure—except your future fanciful ideas of happiness, which I leave with each of you.

I have now, my friends, to show you in detail that all the religions of the world have been founded in ignorance. To those who have been accustomed to reflect deeply on these subjects, the outline stated in the twelve fundamental principles which have been advanced, is amply sufficient to enable them to come, at once, to a conclusion upon the subject. But as there are many who never had their minds directed to these subjects, it becomes necessary to proceed point by point in order to show the discrepancy between these twelve laws and all religions. It is, however, first requisite that I should state what the religions of the world are, according to my views of them. If I make a wrong statement, Mr. Campbell or the gentlemen Moderators will set me right. According to my views, then, all religions of the civilized world are founded upon the assumption that man has a free will, forms his own character, and determines his own conduct; has the power of believing or disbelieving whether a God exists, and of ascertaining his qualities, and is punished for not doing so. These religions assume that man is accountable for his feelings, his thoughts, his will, and his conduct; that if he believes according to the religious dogmas in which he has been trained, and acts up to that belief, he shall be eternally happy; but that if he do not believe in a God, he shall be eternally tormented, notwithstanding the most virtuous and exemplary conduct through life. They assume that the favor of God is to be obtained

by the observance of forms and ceremonies, and by contributions of money; and that those who do not believe in these things, are infidels, and worse than the Devil, because *he* believes and trembles. It becomes necessary, Mr. Campbell, to ask you if this be a true and fair outline of the Christian religion? [*Mr. Campbell answers, No.*] Then, Mr. Chairman, before I can proceed systematically, it will be necessary for Mr. Campbell to explain what the Christian religion is. I cannot proceed without I have his christian religion before me. Each different sect will tell me that Mr. Campbell's religion is not theirs. At present I have nothing to combat; I am fighting against shadows.

Mr. Campbell rose and said—The Christian religion is contained in the New Testament. Mr. Owen ought to have made himself acquainted with the New Testament before he challenged this controversy. I have no other answer to Mr. Owen's query but that the Christian religion is fully developed in the books of the New Testament; that its evidences are to be examined by all the rules by which we examine other historical facts; that the rules of interpretation are the same which are to be adopted in the interpretation of other ancient writings.

Mr. Owen rose and said—Gentlemen: If I take Mr. Campbell's account of christianity to be correct, a great many christians will oppose Mr. Campbell, and say he knows nothing about christianity; therefore it will not be sufficient for me to show that Mr. Campbell's notions of christianity cannot be reconciled with these fundamental laws of human nature. But perhaps we may come at the matter in another direction: Has man, according to christianity, a free will, and the power to form his own character? I cannot proceed without an answer to this question.

Mr. Campbell rises—Gentlemen Moderators: If it be the order of the day, that my opponent and I shall enter into a catechetical examination of each other, by way of question and answer, I shall make no objection to such an arrangement. In engaging in this controversy, the sole object I proposed to myself, was the fair elicitation of truth. But the immediate question is, whether interrogatories are to be mutually and reciprocally proposed and replied to, or shall our interrogatories be propounded in our respective half-hour addresses, and the answers deferred until the respondent rises to address the audience? I make this point here simply as a question of order.

Mr. Owen rose and said—I do not see how the argument can be conducted on the original plan of alternate half hours. We must come to close quarters; but unless I know what the christian religion is, I cannot know what I am to disprove. I have made fair tenders to Mr. Campbell in order to find out what his christian religion is. I cannot conceive that the christian religion consists in the whole of the New Testament, but that it is contained in some general principles which may be stated in a very few words.

Mr. Campbell rose and said—As my opponent seems to be at a

loss how to proceed without documents, perhaps we may expedite our progress by presenting a recapitulation of our premises by way of posting our books up to this morning.

The Hon. Chairman rose and said—The Moderators are prepared to decide the question of order submitted by Mr. Campbell. They are of opinion, from the nature of Mr. Owen's proposition, he is not entitled to call on Mr. Campbell for any concession; he is only entitled to call on Mr. Campbell for a definition of his terms. We view the matter in this light: Mr. Owen states, by implication, that he has examined all the religions of the world. This implication results, necessarily, from Mr. Owen's affirmation, that all religions in the world are founded in ignorance. We cannot, for a moment, presume that Mr. Owen has passed sentence of condemnation upon all religions, without having examined these religions, and ascertained what they are. Inasmuch as Mr. Owen holds the affirmative of the proposition that all religions are false, the Moderators think that it would be exceedingly discourteous in them to suppose that Mr. Owen has not studied all religions. The Moderators conceive that it would be taking from Mr. Owen's opponent an advantage to put *him* upon the affirmative. We must take it for granted that there are many individuals in this assembly who have full faith in the truth of the christian religion, and yet would not agree, perhaps, with any other individual of this congregation in every minute particular. Courtesy to Mr. Owen compels us to suppose that he has ascertained the fundamental principles of all religions, and has here proposed to demonstrate that all are founded in ignorance and error. This is Mr. Owen's *affirmative* proposition, and according to all controversial rules, he is, therefore, bound to establish it in evidence. The adoption of any other course in the conducting of this argument by Mr. Owen, we conceive, would, in another point of view, be imposing upon his opponent an unfair difficulty. For, if it should be ascertained, at the termination of this discussion, that Mr. Owen has formed erroneous conceptions of the christian religion, and has proceeded to condemn it under these mistaken ideas of its real character, it would not be fair to place Mr. Campbell in a logical predicament which might deprive him of an opportunity to demonstrate that his opponent's conceptions of christianity were erroneous, and thereby to disprove his conclusions. This would be to throw Mr. Campbell off the vantage ground, which, as the *challengee*, he legitimately holds. Courtesy toward Mr. Owen, therefore, compels us to take for granted that he has thoroughly examined every religion, which he has undertaken to condemn; and that the reasons of his condemnation are applicable to his peculiar conceptions of these religions.

The Board are further of opinion, that Mr. Owen cannot be fairly called upon to admit that religion is what Mr. Campbell supposes it to be. It may be, that Mr. Owen may assent to Mr. Campbell's views of religion, yet this assent would not prove Mr. Campbell's views to be correct. It would not be doing justice to Mr. Campbell

to require him to state his views of christianity, and authorize Mr. Owen to argue from them as the only correct standard; because, Mr. Owen would thereby be deprived of all opportunity of demonstrating that Mr. Campbell's views of christianity were not warranted by the christian scriptures. Therefore, the opinion of the Board is, that Mr. Owen's proper course is to state his views of religion, assign the reasons upon which his opinions are founded, and draw his conclusions from the premises which he may establish; and if his opponent can show that religion is not the thing which Mr. Owen has condemned, then the cause of religion remains safe and uninjured by this argument.

Mr. Owen again rises—Mr. Chairman: It appears, then, from this decision, that I must form my own notions of religion, from all that I have read, seen, and heard—and I am quite willing so to do.

My belief, then, is, that in all religions of the world, it is a fundamental principle that man has a free will, forms his own character, and determines his own conduct; that he has the power of believing or disbelieving in a God, of ascertaining his attributes and qualities, and that he shall be punished hereafter if he does not believe in a God, and ascertain these attributes and qualities; that he is accountable for his will, his conduct, his feelings, and his thoughts; and if he believes according to the dogmas of his religion, and acts up to that belief, he shall be happy after death; but that if he does not believe in God, in his qualities and attributes, he shall after death be eternally tormented. I believe it is a fundamental principle in all religions, that prayers, and forms, and ceremonies are necessary to enable the individual to know God; and it is, moreover, necessary that he should contribute money for all godly purposes; that in all these religions, whoever disbelieves is an infidel. Therefore, I am an infidel, for I believe none of them. I have then to show, in detail, that man has not a free will; that he does not form his own character, nor determine his own conduct. I have to show, in detail, that no man has the power of believing or disbelieving in a God; that he has no means of ascertaining the qualities and attributes of any being whose mode of existence cannot be cognizable by his senses. I shall, therefore, endeavor to show, in detail, what a monstrous absurdity it is, to suppose that man, constituted as he is, can be accountable for his feelings, thoughts, will, or conduct. I mean also to prove that there cannot be one particle of merit or demerit in any man's believing the doctrines of the religion in which he has been trained. I intend also to demonstrate the utter fallacy of the notion that man will go to heaven for his belief, or to hell for his disbelief. I intend further to show, that religious forms and ceremonies are most useless; and that if men were not more ignorant than the beasts of the field, they would never pay money to a priest for showing them the way to heaven.

I also mean to prove that the opprobrious meaning generally annexed to the epithet *infidel*, is most irrational and absurd: How can

an infidel, if any of you attach any definite meaning to the term, prevent himself believing as he does, any more than he can help being warmed by the sun, or cooled by the breeze? Now, my friends, these are the points I mean to prove. I might indeed go much further. I might attack some of the details of the christian system, which are not to be found in any other systems of religion. I might tell you that it is a fundamental principle in the christian religion, to believe that Christ is the son of God; that he came down from Heaven to save sinners, or a certain portion of them, called the elect; that he was crucified, rose and ascended to Heaven; and that now he is certainly interceding for us there. But, my friends, after having been so long a faithful student of the laws of nature, and after the mental collisions which I have encountered with the first minds in Europe and America, I should feel ashamed seriously to attempt any opposition to such monstrous absurdities — such a ridiculous incongruity. But I know that we are beings so organized as to receive our early impressions, however absurd they may be. We are compelled, by an unchanging law of our nature, to receive our early impressions, however monstrous and absurd, from our parents, our nurses, and other early instructors. This is an indisputable truth; therefore, there cannot be a more simple process than to force into the mind of any child doctrines, notions, and chimeras, the most wild, extravagant, and fanciful, and at the same time, compel him to receive them as divine truths. This being a law of our nature, I cannot be surprised at the variety of absurd notions which I everywhere meet with. It was only, I think, about two months ago, that I very unexpectedly found myself in the middle of the great square of the city of Mexico. Suddenly I heard the tinkling of a little bell, which was in the hands of a man preceding the host. My friend, who was with me, said to me, Mr. Owen, you must kneel down till that bell passes, or you will endanger your life. Hearing this, I looked out for the cleanest place I could find, spread my handkerchief upon it, and knelt down. [*The audience here laughed heartily.*] But why laugh at this, my friends? these Mexicans were as sincerely conscientious in performing and executing this act of adoration to their host, as you are in going to any place of worship.

The whole difference is, that you have been trained in one sect of religious notions, and they have been trained in another; and if rationality could be estimated by numbers, it is very doubtful whether those who believe in the importance and necessity of this act of prostration, do not outnumber you who disbelieve and laugh at it. But the great stumbling-block of the metaphysicians is, that man is formed to have a free will; and, therefore, by his will can control his belief and his conduct. Now I have stated it to be one of the fundamental laws of human nature, that the infant, when born, has no knowledge of his organization; but he then comes into the world a highly compounded being, made up of a great variety

of propensities, faculties, and qualities—and upon this foundation of his organization, his intellect, morals, and will, are formed for him. Now these propensities are made either good or bad—these intellects and morals are made superior or inferior; but whether the one or the other, how is it possible that the infant can be held accountable for it in any degree whatever? When we see a little child obeying the impulse of its nature, and thereby acting contrary to our notions of right and wrong, we say *that* child is bad by nature; we punish it, and call it hard names for acting in opposition to our notions, when the real cause of all the evil is the ignorance in which we have been trained. I dare say many of you have now in your eye the children of different families of your acquaintance, and the difference in the characters of these children. You know that these children have been trained very differently—that the children of the one family have, according to your notions, been well brought up, while those of the other have been badly trained, and you have witnessed the consequent difference of character in these two families. Are not these inferior children unfortunate in being under the direction of the ignorant and vicious? and is it not fortunate for the superior children that they have been placed in the care of the more virtuous and intelligent? But who shall say that either merit or demerit attaches to either set of children, on account of their difference of character? To illustrate how little depends upon the power of the infant itself in the formation of its character, observe the effects produced upon the children brought up by the people called Quakers. I am not so competent to speak of this sect as it exists in this country, but in England I am well acquainted with the first families among them, and I have uniformly found the children of these Quaker families brought up very differently from the children of other families; but no merit or demerit can attach to these children for having been thus fortunately born and educated. In my frequent visits to London, I have made a part of my business to go frequently to that part of the city called St. Giles. This division of the city is extensive, and the number of its inhabitants considerable. I have there seen many children of parents reduced to the lowest depths of poverty, and yet obliged to support themselves and their parents. They have no means to do this except by thieving; and, therefore, from earliest infancy they compel their children to believe that they perform a most meritorious action when they can dextrously steal; and when they succeed, and bring home their plunder, they are called *good* children, and rewarded by their parents with something they think will gratify them. But if they do not succeed in their day's prowling, and come home empty-handed, their parents call them *very bad* children, and punish them severely. Now these children are compelled to believe that to steal is very meritorious, and *not* to steal is very wicked. These children never hear anything of what is called good moral instruction. With what justice, then, can they be condemned for their vices? It is with these unfortunate

children as with all others—some of them are born with organizations greatly superior to others, but they are all equally compelled to imbibe the same early lessons of depravity.

But the truth is, that no child can have the forming of himself, any more than he can have the selection of his parents. When we reflect upon this matter, we shall discover that the child has just as much control in the one case as the other. How absurd, then, must be the invention of a system which leaves the child at the mercy of chance, and then exacts responsibility from him!

I do say, that nothing but the grossest ignorance could have led to the introduction of a system which supposes this to be right. It is contrary to nature, and not in the least degree calculated to effect the purposes which it contemplates. It is anything but a rational method of operating upon the human mind.

I conclude that there are intelligent medical gentlemen present, who have made it their business to study minutely the human frame. They well know that all children are born with different degrees of powers and feelings. They know, also, that probably from the begining of time, no two individuals ever had any two senses formed alike; that there are no two who see, or feel, or taste, or hear, or smell alike. Each individual has a distinct natural character at birth, arising from the peculiar combination which has entered into each of his senses. Those gentlemen well know, that when the organization is perfect, the human being becomes superior; that when it is imperfect, the child must ever be, to a certain extent, an inferior human being, if placed under similar circumstances with the former. Now, if we had the power to form our organization and characters, can we suppose that beings possessing one particle of reason would not make these perfect? I ask you whether every male and female would not make themselves perfect? The only reason that we are not perfect beings is, because we have no power over the formation of our organization and circumstances. Yesterday Mr. Campbell said a great deal upon the subject of language. Now no child has the power of deciding what language it shall be taught, and he can only derive oral instruction through that language which he has learned to understand. No child can determine what religion he shall be taught to believe, or whether he shall retain his belief. No child can determine what shall be the character of his circumstances from birth to death, except in the latter part of his life, and in that case he has been influenced to endeavor to effect some change by the previous circumstances to which he was compelled to submit.

We very well know (if we did not, we might all easily try the experiment), that over the power of belief or disbelief, no man ever has had, or ever can have, any control. As Mr. Campbell has very well explained, we *know* that of which our senses take cognizance; but in like manner, we are compelled to *believe* according to the strongest impressions made upon us. And so, too, of opinions; we

receive them according to the evidence offered to us for their foundation, and we are compelled to receive them. Our liking, indifference, or disliking, are also in like manner equally beyond our control. We *must* be indifferent to that which makes no impression upon our senses, and dislike that which offends our senses. It is futile, useless, and injurious to contend against these laws of our nature. My half hour, I perceive, is out. I will, therefore, merely add, that if these are *facts*, and I will prove them to be such, that nothing but the grossest ignorance could ever have permitted any such system as the christian, or any other religion, to have been introduced, and that nothing but this ignorance causes it or them to be now tolerated.

MR. CAMPBELL'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—In the first place, I beg leave to post up the argument so far as prosecuted. I therefore submit the following items by way of recapitulation — *Imprimis:* We have shown that my friend's system of *necessity*, renders men as incapable of society and of moral and civil government as if they were trees, stones, or machines. To this refutation of his system, Mr. Owen has, as yet, paid no attention. 2d. We have shown that Mr. Owen's system is not founded upon any philosophic analysis of the physical, intellectual, or moral man. 3d. We have shown that, so far as religion is concerned, Mr. Owen's opposition to it has been principally founded upon a palpable error, viz: that man's volition has no power over his belief. To this argument he has not thought proper to reply. 4th. That his system is radically defective in this—that it leaves entirely out of view our power of acquiring information through testimony. 5th. That his system ascribes to imagination a creative power which it does not possess. 6th. That, according to Mr. Owen's views, it was impossible to account for the derivation or existence of the spiritual ideas and language now prevalent in the world. 7th. That his twelve facts, admitting them to be true, fall far short of presenting a view of the whole man; and, consequently, that every system founded upon them must fail to furnish objects commensurate with man's capacity of enjoyment, or the dignity of his intellectual nature. To not one of these capital items has Mr. Owen replied. As Mr. Owen has very courteously presented me with a copy of his twelve facts, I now present him with some notes in writing, in the shape of objections to some of his fundamental points.

The objection that my friend has been urging this morning against christianity, reminds me of certain objections which I have heard to the revolution of this globe round the center of the planetary system. In speaking of the sphericity of the earth, I have, in language adapted to vulgar apprehension, informed the uninformed and illiterate, that this earth was round as a ball. They have replied that they were very sure this statement was untrue, because they perceived hills,

mountains, valleys, and a very uneven surface, which, as they conceived, were altogether irreconcilable with the rotundity of this globe. In like manner they have objected to the immobility of the sun. They reply, "We see the sun move; we see it rise in one place and set in another; and if the earth moved round the sun, the position of our plantations and houses must necessarily be shifted: your theory about the earth and sun, then, is contrary to our experience and observation." Now it is just in a similar style of objection that my friend attacks the christian religion. Mr. Owen, it seems, wants to elicit my opinion on what constitutes the christian religion. Does he suppose that christianity consists in matters of opinion? I am free to declare that neither the Jewish nor the christian religion was ever designed by their Author to consist in any matter of opinion whatever. I hesitate not also to aver, that this error is the root from which all sectarianism has sprung, and has given rise to all the skepticism which now prevails. Mr. Owen informs us that he became a skeptic from the jarring sectarianism and irreconcilable discrepancies in the different dogmas of christianity. This would, indeed, be an unprofitable discussion, were it to be confined to a mere war of words concerning the opinions which constitute this, that, or the other system of religion. This would suit my friend's scheme well enough; but I hardly think he will be able to seduce us into a discussion upon the subject of *free will*, a topic on which he himself is so fond of expressing his opinions. But I was proceeding to observe, that if we had no other proof of the scriptures being divine oracles than just the contents of *the* book (*Biblos*), that alone would warrant us in the conclusion, for we see the handwriting of the Almighty indelibly inscribed in the pages of this volume. The same grand developments displayed in the "pillar'd firmament," are to be found in the sacred volume; and they both proclaim with equal emphasis, that "the hand which made them is divine." In the physical organization of the material universe, we discover that the laws of attraction and repulsion are the most operative. We see the great God of Nature continually producing most wonderful results by the simple operation of one single law. What philosopher does not know the power of the centrifugal and centripetal forces in balancing our globe? Who does not know that the successive change of the seasons results from one single unerring law laid down by the great Creator himself? Now in expelling from the human heart that darkness in which, without the light of revelation it must ever have remained, in elevating the human mind to the contemplation of spiritual things, the Almighty acts by a few general laws. He raises man to heaven by the simple operation of two or three fundamental principles. Were this point in argument now, I would boldly hazard the assertion that the sacred volume contains intrinsic evidences of being come from God—because the same plan and consummate wisdom displayed in the construction of the material universe, are equally developed in these holy oracles in the renovation of man. But if the contents of the volume of revelation and

the constituent principles of religion therein inculcated are to become the subjects of investigation in this debate, they should be taken only from *the book* which contains them.

In such an investigation I apprehend that Mr. Owen cannot be permitted to travel out of the record. But we will take *the book* (*Biblos*) and examine what is written there, by the same *criteria* which we would apply in an analysis of the writings of Cicero, of Demosthenes, of Sallust, or of Xenophon. But the time has not yet come for me to reply to my friend's religious *opinions* and social views in his own favorite style.

There was, however, one point on which my opponent had nearly staggered upon the truth. He asked if christianity consisted in the whole of the New Testament, or primarily in a few general principles and leading facts therein contained? He apprehended the latter, and that these might be stated in a very few words. I presume he must have had reference to the historic facts that Jesus Christ died for the salvation of sinners, that he rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven, etc. Now, this is the only legitimate mode of arguing this topic.

Yesterday we discussed the evidences of the Jewish religion. We have been pursuing the very plan which our opponent suggests. Has it not been repeatedly affirmed that both the Jewish and christian religion are founded upon historic facts—facts triable by the same criteria as all other historic facts? After proceeding a little farther in the argument, I shall be perfectly willing to conform strictly to Mr. Owen's plan. I have asserted that the christian religion, as well as the Jewish, was founded on facts. And I will rest the whole merits of this controversy upon my ability to prove the three leading facts on which christianity is based, and the consequent inability of my opponent to disprove them. First, That Jesus Christ was crucified upon Mount Calvary, as attested by the four Evangelists. Second, That his body was deposited in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. And thirdly, That he did actually rise from the dead, and appeared upon the earth for forty days, having during that time repeated intercourse with his disciples, and that at the end of that period he did actually ascend to heaven. Now, this tender closes every avenue to the introduction of metaphysical subtitly, or mere opinions about christianity into this argument. I am thoroughly convinced that it was the simple, sublime, and majestic design of him "whose ways are not as man's ways," to effect an entire moral revolution in mankind by the simple operation of the intrinsic weight, validity, and moral energy of these facts. I am thoroughly convinced that all the principles necessary to make man happy, and elevate his nature to its highest point of dignity, and to enable him to meet death fearlessly, are native to, inherent in, and inalienable from, these facts—I mean the facts that Jesus Christ was crucified, buried, and that he rose again on the third day. The influence of these facts is irresistible. No man ever did honestly believe them who did

not in consequence thereof experience that all his powers and faculties were exalted and refined. And thus, in the wonderful wisdom of God, has the whole moral and religious revolution which he designed to effect over the world, been founded upon the operative moral energy of these facts.

Mr. Owen speaks of the endless varieties of religion; but the world has never had but three divine religious dispensations; the first adapted to the primitive state of man—the second adapted to the spirit and genius of a people living under social and municipal institutions, and prophetic and typical of the advent of Christ, the Son of God and the founder of *christianity*. And these three divine developments of religion all concentrate themselves upon the fact that Jesus rose from the dead, ascended to heaven, and was there received as the Son of God. We do know that all the superstitions in the world have grown out of these three developments of divine authority in matters of religion. What is Mahometanism but a corruption of christianity? I would not call the Persian, the Roman, nor the Egyptian religions different religions, but different sects of the same religion; just as I would call Mahometanism a corruption of christianity. There is not a single supernatural truth in the Koran, that is not borrowed from the Testaments. Whatever may have been invented by the licentiousness of human imagination, there never has been but one divinely revealed religion. Hence, in all these superstitions we find capital ideas, sentiments, and terms which could not have been originated by human imagination, or derived from any other source than an immediate and direct divine revelation. We can show that all the national records which have come down to us from times of the highest antiquity, embrace the outlines of the Mosaic account in the book of *Genesis*. We can show that, in the days of Abraham, with the exception of the Chaldeans, there was not a circumjacent nation that had not all the knowledge possessed by Abraham, save with regard to his own posterity. It was in consequence of the defection of the Chaldeans that Abraham was commanded to depart into a strange land, because that people were apostatizing and falling off from the knowledge of the true God to the worship of idols. So far we have submitted the outlines of this matter with a reference to the past and present. Yesterday I introduced an argument founded upon the historic evidences in support of Judaism and christianity. I presented, in the first instance, certain *criteria* by which we are enabled to decide whether historic facts are credible, and gave an analysis of these evidences and their *criteria*. With a reference to the true merits of this controversy, we have laid down four criteria of the verity of historic facts: First, That the recorded facts on which we may rely with safety, must be cognizable by the senses. Second: Have been exhibited in the face of day. Third, That, in perpetual commemoration of these facts, monumental institutions were adopted simultaneously with their occurrence. And, Fourth: Continued down to the present day. We did affirm and

adduce some proofs that no fact possessing these four criteria of its verity, could possibly be false; that it was entirely out of Mr. Owen's power to select a single fact, recorded in the annals of any nation of the world, which, possessing these four criteria of verity, ever was proved to be false. But we intend, before coming to the point more immediately at issue, to show that these matters of fact were not (as skeptics affirm) greedily believed by merely a few friends and partisans; but that these stupendous facts were exhibited, not for the purpose of confirming the belief of friends, but to overcome the disbelief of enemies. Moses (for example) was sent to lead the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, but this people were as unwilling to leave the land, as Pharaoh was to let them go. Hence, the ten stupendous miracles exhibited by Moses were as necessary to persuade the people to depart, as they were to coerce Pharaoh to permit them. The necessary inference is, that the enactment of these ten wonders was as necessary for the conviction of the Israelites as for their oppressors. Moses himself demurred when the conduct of the Israelitish host was cast upon him; the people were unwilling to quit the land of their captivity, and Pharaoh strenuously opposed their departure; but by the resistless influence of these ten wonderful facts, all were made conformable to the divine will. These facts were designed to be of such high import as to reconcile Moses to his responsible undertaking, to overcome the pertinacity and avarice of Pharaoh, and inspire the Israelites with a courage which enabled them to pass fearlessly through the Red Sea. You perceive, then, that all circumstances concurred to preclude the possibility of any deception in regard to the truth of the facts as well as the possibility of their reception upon any slight and superficial evidence. They were, in their nature, calculated to arouse every energy, and to take fast hold upon every feeling of man. They must, therefore, be regarded as facts of the sublimest character, the most momentous import, and the most irresistible influence. The course adopted by my opponent, in this debate, has compelled me to introduce at this stage of the argument the evidences that not only the institutions of the passover, circumcision, the redemption of the first-born, but that divers other commemorative institutions and ritual observances of the Jewish law warrant us in the conclusion that the whole system of the Jewish religion is an antetypical symbolic attestation in proof of the divine mission of the Messiah. And now, as I do not wish immediately to introduce another part of the subject, I resign the floor to my opponent.

MR. OWEN'S SIXTEENTH ADDRESS.

My friends—Our debate is to be published, and therefore the matter advanced by the disputants ought to be such as to command serious reflections, and to exercise the most discriminating powers of our judgment; for this sole reason have I, on divers and sundry occasions in the course of this discussion, pretermitted all reply to my

friend, Mr. Campbell's catechisms. Being quite familiar with the whole range of my friend's arguments and topics, I have been perfectly aware that the further they were pursued, the more mazy, intangible, and interminable the argument would become; and I have therefore been most desirous to keep your attention riveted, if possible, to plain, simple, tangible matters of fact, and to those things from which we may derive the highest practical benefit and utility to ourselves and to our posterity—I desired to keep your judgment and discrimination constantly in exercise, and your imagination out of play. But were I to recognize, even indirectly, that a dissertation concerning Pharaoh and his host—the God who created Pharaoh and hardened his heart, so that he would *not* let the people go—who descended from heaven to cover the earth with all sorts of loathsome and noxious vermin—were I, I say, to recognize a dissertation of the flux and reflux of the Red Sea, and the causing of the uncongealed water to stand up perpendicularly, on each side of its margin, like parallel stone walls in a lane; were I to recognize the narrative of these and other marvels, with which we have been edified, as at all relevant or pertinent to the point of debate at present before us, I should, upon reflection on my conduct, certainly come to the conclusion, that, when I consented to waste my time and yours, in this puerile way, I was out of my senses. Once, for all, my friends, I wish to state distinctly that I cherish sincere good feelings toward my friend, Mr. Campbell. I am sure he is entirely conscientious, and that he is, with an honest zeal, exerting himself to make you to believe what he thinks the truth; but I also discover that Mr. Campbell's mind, (powerful as it is), has from infancy been filled and vitiated with an accumulation of ancient and fabulous legends concerning Pharaoh with his hardened heart; the immobility of the Red Sea, and a variety of other such novelties, which, unfortunately for the true interest, happiness, and virtue of mankind, has been delved out of the rubbish of antiquity, from which none but the most ungoverned imagination would ever have thought of extracting them. My friend, Mr. Campbell, possesses a lively imagination; an imagination which has been deeply involved in these, to him, high mysteries; nature has been bountiful to him in his organization, and many of his talents have been highly cultivated; but what have the circumstances of his learned education in the old seminaries of Europe done for him? why, simply this, they have placed (if I may be allowed to use the figure), a *Chinese shoe* upon a mind vigorous from its birth, and which nature formed capable of being expanded to the largest and most capacious dimensions; but what mind can reach its natural development, when those who have had the forming of it, rivet a Chinese shoe upon it, believing all the while that they are improving it so as to bring forth the most wholesome and abundant harvests of utility and benefit to mankind? Mr. Campbell possesses the power of combining and generalizing with great rapidity; he brings his ideas before you in a very imposing shape; but I have something

more valuable to adduce than legends about Pharaoh and the Red Sea. It is my high duty to place before the world that which may enable them to think rationally, and consequently to adopt a wholesome and beneficial practice. I have undertaken to prove that it is impossible that any religion can be true, because all religions are diametrically opposed to the immutable laws of nature as exhibited in man. I will further undertake to prove that the combined and aggregate influence of all the religions of the world, have not, through all past ages up to the present hour, effected so much for the improvement of mankind in virtue, and consequent happiness, as the general adoption of these principles, when properly applied in practice, will effect in five years. I have, therefore, something to lay before you highly important to yourselves and posterity, and this causes me greatly to deprecate any distraction or confusion of your minds by any useless metaphysical disquisitions, which are, in their nature, almost interminable, and which can never lead to any beneficial practical result. Five senses have been afforded us, and we know of a certainty no facts beyond what these senses teach us ; and these, my friends, are amply sufficient to enable us to understand and appreciate the whole merits of this discussion. Were I, my friends, so far to forget myself and the dignity of the subject which you have been convened to hear discussed, as to bestow the slightest degree of notice upon any of those fanciful notions, miracles, marvels, and fabulous legends, with a critical dissertation upon which my friend has edified us, I should conceive that my time and faculties were just as much wasted and misapplied as if I were to recognize the historic wonders enacted by "Jack, the Giant Killer," as pertinent or relevant to the subject-matter of this debate. Indeed, I conceive the narration of *Jack's* exploits to be less *super*-natural, and therefore more instructive.

My friends, I well know that many of you have, from the earliest infancy, been trained to cherish the utmost reverence for these absurdities ; you reverence them, not only because they are incrusted with the venerable rust of antiquity, but you pay still greater adoration to them, because they have been handed down to you, claiming to have the sanction of that fearful and mysterious, yet unmeaning phrase, "sacred and divine tradition." But that same sense of duty which prompted me to cross so many longitudes and latitudes, in order to give my friend, Mr. Campbell, this meeting, compels me to "cry aloud and spare not;" to speak out boldly and fearlessly the truth. It is contrary to all my feelings, sentiments and professions to outrage where it is avoidable, on prejudice, or to cause the slightest degree of pain or irritation to the feelings of any of my fellow-beings; and had it not been for the irrelevancy to the subject before us of Mr. Campbell's dissertation upon the fables of antiquity, I should not have been compelled to put your feelings, patience, and prejudices to so severe a trial, as I much fear a just and conscientious performance of my high duty will now compel me to do. Because,

if I had been permitted to pursue my intended course in this matter, it would be like proving that one and one made two, and consequently that in proving this position, I at the same time demonstrated that one and one could never make three. For if I prove man to be what I state him to be, I thereby remove the entire foundation on which all religions have been erected. By thus simply stating facts in such a manner that you, my friends, experience, feel, and recognize them to be such, the falsehood of all religions necessarily becomes manifest. By this course, had I been permitted to have adopted it, I should have avoided coming into immediate collision with your early and deep-rooted prejudices.

I have said that man, at birth, is ignorant of everything relative to his own organization, and is not permitted to create any part of his physical or intellectual organization; therefore, that he cannot be bad by nature. He is exactly what nature has made him. You may be sure, therefore, that all religions which assume that man is bad by nature, are false, and founded in ignorance of human nature; and secondly, that no two infants have ever yet been known to possess an identity of organization, and that all these organic differences between individuals have been created without the knowledge or consent of the individuals. Now this is either true or false. Mr. Campbell, if he proceeds logically, will either admit or disprove this first principle; which, if true, renders it impossible for any man to be bad by nature. Again, Mr. Campbell, in order to proceed logically, must admit or disprove the second position: that the organization of no two children have ever been created precisely alike; which, if true, demonstrates that there can neither be merit nor demerit in either, on account of this diversity of birth. After these two points have been acceded to or disproved, we may then logically proceed to the discussion of the third. Now I aver, that all the religions of the world presuppose that children are to be blamed and praised, punished or rewarded, according to their characters. I maintain that this supposition is a gross absurdity, and that nothing but the wanderings of the imagination could have led us into this error. I assume that it is not in the power of man to disprove the two first positions. 3. We affirm that each individual is placed without his knowledge or consent, under circumstances which irresistibly influence and control him; yet that the influence of these circumstances is somewhat modified by the peculiarities of the individual's organization. Now we perceive that the foundation of human character is in our organization, and that in the creation of this organization we have had no manner of agency or control. The further development of our character depends upon our circumstances at birth.

If we had been born among the Romans, we would necessarily have had our religious faith built upon the mysteries and traditions of their mythology, and should have thought, felt, and acted in all things as they did. Had we been born at the time it is said Jesus

Christ lived, we might have assisted to crucify him, or been among his disciples. But it does not depend upon us *when* we shall come into the world, although our future character depends so materially upon it, as well as upon the particular place or country in which we receive our impressions. Did any of us prevent ourselves from being born in the city of Constantinople? Could any of the Turks who have been born in that city, have prevented it from being their birth-place? or could they help being taught the Mahometan religion? Now, is there a man in this assembly who blames a native of the city of Constantinople for having been born a Turk, and consequently educated a Mussulman? It is absurd to suppose that merit or demerit can attach to the individual on account of the place of his nativity, or the peculiarity of his education. It is too gross a folly to attempt to reason in contradiction of such facts as these. Nothing but the overwhelming effects of early and continued impressions could induce, or rather compel, any one to contend against such facts as these. No, my friends, 'tis an immutable law of nature, that man shall not decide when or where he shall be born, or what religion he shall be taught. We well know with what tenacity the great mass of mankind retain their early impressions. There is no more merit in being a christian than a cannibal; both are what their organization and circumstances, over neither of which they cannot be supposed to have had the least control, have compelled them to be. Is not the whole matter as obvious as that two and two make four?

I may also remark, that no child can be supposed to have the least influence in deciding who shall be its parents. Now what an important circumstance in forming the character of each individual is this! Whether the child shall come into existence in the midst of a vicious and degraded family, or whether he shall be born into a family of the purest habits, the highest intelligence, and the most virtuous and amiable dispositions. The opposition between the circumstances of two children thus differently ushered into the world, is immense. But ought the child that has been thus fortunate in its parentage to be praised for the consequences which proceed from it? or is the offspring of vice and iniquity to be blamed for the vicious impression received from its parentage? This is a case in which it is easy to suppose the two extremes. But the child which has been most unfortunate in the circumstances of its birth-place and education, claims more of our care, pity, and attention, than the child around whose cradle the most propitious circumstances have shed their influence from the hour of its birth. You see, therefore, that the individual has no choice as to his country, his parentage, his language, or any of those things which constitute the whole foundation of his character. And thus his character is entirely formed for him, without his knowledge, will, or consent; and we all know the influence which our early impressions exercise over our future lives and conduct. Have I, my friends, said enough to convince you of the

errors of all religions which pre-suppose quite the reverse of all this, and give a very different direction to all our thoughts and feelings? If not, I will go on, for the subject is inexhaustible.

The fifth fundamental law of human nature is, "That each individual is so created that, when young, he may be made to receive impressions, to produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits; and to retain them with great tenacity." Suppose all the children in the world were placed under circumstances to receive false notions, and the fact is so, for I believe the minds of the present and all past generations have been placed under circumstances in which, instead of receiving the truth, they have been compelled to receive false notions upon every subject in which their happiness is the most involved; and this has arisen from our imagination having been much more cultivated on all religious and moral subjects than any of our other faculties. The whole world has been governed alone by imagination on all these subjects. We have been so much deceived in consequence, that we have called ourselves reasonable beings; but there never was a greater misnomer. What is there that is reasonable now in the private and public conduct of mankind? I have, for forty years, been trying to discover what nation or people thought or acted in a rational manner. Everywhere have I sought to find a reasonable population, but my search has been fruitless. I have found them all governed, up to this hour, by the most irrational notions, directly contrary to right reason and their own interests and happiness. It is not for the interest or happiness of any portion of mankind to act as they now do. By their present mode of proceedings mankind are just as much opposing their real interest as the child who would spurn from him the most strengthening food or the most salutary medicine. All your arrangements denote the absence of reason. Look to those of government, religion, law, commerce, war, and domestic purposes, and they all partake of this character—they all tend to counteract your object, which is to be as happy as the nature of your organization will permit. My friends, consider the nature of the duty which I have to perform. Knowing that you have from infancy imbibed the most erroneous notions derived from the wildest imaginations, what measures can I, a stranger, take to enable you so far to unassociate the ideas which have been forced into your minds as to enable you to re-create those minds, to be born again, and thus become rational beings? This, my friends, is no light task. It requires a knowledge of human nature, patience, and perseverance, and self-devotion to the happiness and well-being of my species alone, which can enable me to disregard all that you may say or think of me, all that you do to me, for the sake of doing you good. I *can* have no *individual* interest in removing your prejudices. What private emolument, aggrandizement or remuneration could I ever have promised myself from the beginning of my arduous course up to the present moment? I was deeply affected by the

degraded state in which I discovered all nations to be, and interested for the happiness of my species, or I never would have come forward to combat the darling prejudices of, I may say, the whole world. But I well knew that unless somebody would stand in the gap and expose himself to the risk of being sacrificed, mankind must ever remain creatures influenced and governed only by the errors of their early impressions, which render them daily and hourly liable to every kind of suffering and misery, for which there exists no other necessity than ignorance of our nature. Had I not been thoroughly convinced that I could only influence you to direct your attention to simple facts, and discard the illusions arising from early impressions, made through the imagination, and that you could all thereby attain to a high degree of virtue and happiness, I would never have put my all to hazard by coming forward as I have done. I only ask you, my friends, when your passions are calm and your judgment cool, to take these twelve laws of our nature under your consideration; to examine them with the severest scrutiny, and to read, learn, mark, and inwardly digest them, until you fully comprehend them. For, my friends, it does require time to penetrate into the subject so as to understand it fully. Not that the subject is intricate in itself, but the excessive and extravagant cultivation of your imaginations in opposition to existing facts, have almost destroyed your judgments. This is the only reason why you cannot follow me as rapidly as I wish to proceed with my developments and demonstrations of these twelve laws, and of the highly beneficial practice to which they will lead. No, my friends, before you can follow me in my illustrations with that intensity of interest which the subject is so pre-eminently calculated to inspire, these twelve laws must have previously occupied your most serious and mature reflections. They are adapted to secure your health, your comfort, your peace of mind, and they will open human nature to your perusal in like manner as you would unfold a topographical map.

After you once thoroughly understand these twelve laws, and shall be informed of what country, class, sect, and party, any individual belongs, you will know, to a very considerable extent, what that individual is. His general thoughts, views and feelings will be familiar to you. It may appear, my friends, presumptuous and assuming when I state the fact that the whole of human nature lies as palpably open to my perusal as ever the map of any country was presented to you. Therefore I cannot be surprised at anything I hear or see. I can immediately trace the effect to its cause; and if you too, my friends, only possessed this knowledge, so easily to be attained, it would minister to you a joy, peace, and consolation, that you would not exchange for all the world possesses.

MR. CAMPBELL'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—My friend, Mr. Owen, in his last address, has advanced a great many assertions, the bearing of which, upon the

subject before us, I cannot perceive, unless, indeed, Mr. Owen's experience is to be received as tantamount to incontrovertible proof. But my opponent, numerous as his assertions are, advances nothing tangible. He avers, indeed, that he has no attachment to metaphysics; that he contemns metaphysical speculations, and seems plainly to insinuate that I wished either in whole or in part to base my defense of christianity upon hair-breadth metaphysical subtilties. Now I confidently appeal to every individual in this assembly, whether my principal, my sole aim, has not been to disentangle the evidences of christianity, and every point connected with this controversy, from what was metaphysical or abstract. In the course of this discussion have I not tendered an issue to my opponent upon several points? So vague and indefinite is my opponent in the use of his terms, that I do not even know what he means by the word *fact*. [*Here Mr. Owen defines* a fact *to be that which exists.*] Well, now, we have my friend's definition of the word *fact;* he tells us a fact is that which *exists;* but I apprehend that no philologist will assent to this definition of the word. At this time my opponent relies upon twelve facts, which are to subvert all other historic facts and evidences in the world. These twelve facts, then, must be more puissant than Aaron's rod; than the ten categories of Aristotle; than the twelve tables of the *Decemviri;* than the precepts of the decalogue; or any code of laws or system of legislation ever invented. For, by these twelve facts, every religious impression is to be obliterated; every religious idea is to be annihilated. Upon these twelve facts are founded an entirely new theory of man, and a universal moral renovation. Sometimes these are twelve divine laws of human nature; sometimes twelve logical propositions to be demonstrated; and then, twelve facts more potent than the rod of Moses. But out of all these twelve wonderful facts, where is the tangible fact before us? We have been told that a fact is *that which exists;* but a stone exists, and so does a tree, an idea, an opinion. But can we logically say that an opinion is a matter of fact? Definitions of this character are to be found in the writings of the commentators upon the Justinian code—definitions which serve no other purpose but to obscure the text. We must have a more logical definition than this—*a fact is that which exists.* Stones, trees, and opinions exist, and are all these alike to be considered as matters of fact? But my friend has conceived twelve imaginations; he has twelve pretty dreams about human nature; and on these he has ventured to found everything necessary to the happiness of man. Now suppose Mr. Owen should attempt to prove that there never was such a man as General Washington, and no such historic fact as the American Revolution, and no such monumental commemorative institution as the annual celebration of the fourth of July; that there never existed an Emperor Augustus, or an Emperor Napoleon; suppose, I repeat, that he should undertake to prove that Washington, the father of his country, the great moral hero, never existed,

and that the United States have never been emancipated from the thraldom of the parent country; it would, I contend, be just as logical, as pertinent, and as rational, in Mr. Owen to adduce these twelve facts in evidence that all these matters of history were mere fictions and fables, as to attempt to prove, by the adduction of his twelve laws of human nature, that the facts on which religion is founded never had existence. There appears to me to be just as much logic, reason, and good sense in the one process of demonstration, as in the other.

All my anticipations have, in the course of this discussion, been entirely disappointed. I did expect to have matters of fact plainly, rationally, and logically presented. I did expect to witness a powerful display of that reason which skeptics so much adore. Now judge of my mortification in finding nothing presented to me but intangible verbiage; in discovering that my friend uses terms and phrases in a sense entirely at variance with their received interpretation and common acceptation; in a sense irreconcilable to what we call the common sense of mankind. I see plainly that there is nothing left for me but to proceed to avail myself of this opportunity of presenting the true grounds and solid reasons on which we christians build our faith.

Christianity is universally represented to be matter of belief, and belief always requires testimony. Now the question is, *whether the christian belief is rational?* Christianity does not pretend to be a treatise on chemistry, or botany, or mathematics; but it makes a demand upon our faith; and is, simply, belief predicated upon testimony. All that it requires is, to examine its evidences; and the principal end and aim proposed in this discussion, to which the public has been invited, was *an examination into the evidences of christianity.*

It is conceded that our religion is built upon faith, and, therefore, all that can be legitimately inquired into on this topic is, whether this is a faith which a man, in possession of his intellectual powers and his five senses, can rationally entertain; whether a man of a sound mind can reasonably be a christian. I presume this to be the true predicament of this discussion in its present stage. The question is, Whether to be christians we must become dreaming enthusiasts, and the mere creatures of wild imagination? or, on the other hand, Can we be christians on rational evidence and irrefutable testimony? I think I should be almost willing to leave it to a jury of twelve skeptics to decide, whether or not this is the legitimate question to be discussed here. The question before us is, Whether or not testimony on which christianity is built, is of a character to carry conviction to rational minds? if so, every rational man must believe christianity; if otherwise, he must reject it. I maintain that there is no other question at present before us. Now, in the prosecution of this inquiry, I have laid myself fairly open to the detection of any fallacy into which I may chance to fall. I have invited any

gentleman who may be in possession of any historic, philosophic, or logical objection to my argument, to adduce it either orally or in writing; and I now reiterate the pledge to meet fairly, every fair and logical objection. I contend that I now stand upon the proper ground. I am not afraid that if all the lights of science were radiated upon christianity, that any fallacy could be detected; but I contend this is no scientific question for scientific men to differ and speculate upon. I contend that the legitimate grounds on which christianity is to be founded, are those which have been stated. We yesterday progressed so far in the argument introduced, as to inquire of you, if there were an individual among you who could be induced to set apart one hour of his time, or one lamb of his flock, or to plant a single stone in the ground, in perpetual commemoration of a fact which never did occur.

I will venture to assert that if the people of Cincinnati were to erect twelve stone pillars upon the banks of the Ohio, commemorative of the fact that the first founders of this city passed over the refluent waters of the Ohio, as over dry land; took possession of this site, and here located themselves permanently; I say, these twelve stones erected in perpetual attestation of this supposed matter of fact would not be permitted to stand for one year. Such monuments would shock the common sense of little boys, and they would prostrate them. I do not believe they could keep their monuments standing even a single day. But there is a nation now existing, which derives its origin from a period of more remote antiquity than that in which the foundation of the Chaldean, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, Roman, or any other empire of antiquity was laid. Every living vestige of these once great and mighty empires of antiquity has disappeared; and there does not now exist the man who can trace up his lineage to any Greek or Roman progenitors, notwithstanding the ample means possessed by these nations of perpetuating the memory of their national existence and grandeur.

But the Jewish nation is still in existence, and we see them still holding fast their venerable oracles, which were delivered to them four thousand years ago, and able to trace up their ancestry to old Abraham and Sarah. We discover them still devotedly attached to a religion so admirably contrived that it does not contain a type nor a symbol which was not designed for its perpetuation, and which does not prove it to be divine.

The Jewish was, indeed, a nation *sui generis*, the only nation we know of, whose records are coetaneous with their primitive origin. These records were most solemnly deposited in that sacred chest, under the cherubim of glory, which none but the consecrated high priest dare approach. In it were deposited the two tables of the covenant in the handwriting of Jehovah. Their records not only constituted all the religion of the country, but the whole of the civil and municipal polity of their repository. Their whole institution was awful and terrible, and calculated to inspire reverence in the

minds of all who had witnessed every monumental fact recorded in it. They had witnessed two millions of their cotemporaries pass through the Red Sea; they had heard the voice of God and the sound of the trumpet; that had seen two millions sustained in the wilderness for forty years by a miracle; that had witnessed the miraculous passage over the Jordan. These were facts which caused the hearts of the natives to quake before the army of the Israelites, so that they gave up their possessions to them almost without resistance. The annals of this nation, coetaneous with their existence, have been wonderfully preserved; their religion alone has preserved these records. Moreover, the Jews have been made to hold these oracles in such a manner as to preclude the possibility of any collusion between them and christianity.

Never was there such a climax of evidence presented. I am now looking back four thousand years; and am showing that from the remotest periods of antiquity there never has existed the possibility of imposition in regard to these facts; in proof of this, I contend that it is impossible to impose upon any people the solemn and perpetual observance of an institution commemorative of a circumstance that never did occur. I defy Mr. Owen to produce the instance on record which goes to refute this position; or the historic fact possessing the four criteria which can be proved to be false.* But all the evidences are not yet before you.

What is the philosophic character of this religion? Previously to the patriarchal revelations, it is presumable that there was not in the whole vocabulary of human speech terms expressive of the character and purposes of God or of spiritual ideas. In revealing religion to man, it became necessary to give him also a new vocabulary. This was executed, as we teach children, by signs, the art of reading and writing. We will take our illustration from the philosophy of a child's primer book. There we find the picture of a house, a tree, lamb, etc. etc. Now, what does this mean? Is it intended merely to amuse the child? No: it is based upon the philosophy of his nature—upon the supposition that the infant, in order to associate

* Mr. Dennison of Cincinnati, a learned and intelligent teacher of the christian religion, gave me the following statement: "A skeptical gentleman, in Scotland, spent twenty years in scrutinizing the history of all nations and all religions, to obtain the knowledge of facts, or miracles, which might be tested by the same criteria by which the advocates of christianity test the facts adduced to sustain the credibility of the scriptures composing the Old and New Testaments. He imagined that he could subvert the whole system of christianity, by showing that the fictitious miracles, alleged by the Pagans, Mahometans and others, to have been performed in attestation of the truth of religions acknowledged by christians to be false, are as well entitled to credence as those facts on which the truth of the christian religion is founded. But his laborious researches and investigations, during this long period, resulted in an ingenuous confession of his total inability to accomplish his design, in a complete assurance of the truth and divine origin of the christian religion, and in a public profession of faith in Christ. Such is the force of truth on minds not entirely blinded by prejudice, theory, or preconceived opinions."

ideas, must have the aid of sensible characters. There is much philosophy implied in the invention of a child's primer. The idea of a house is presented to the child in a diagram of an inch square. Thus the child discovers that a house can be represented artificially in so small a compass; and thus the way is prepared for introducing into its mind the use of literal characters; the letter A being as perfectly artificial as the picture of a house. In this way a child is taught to discriminate the elementary artificial characters of written language, and then we teach it the influence of these characters in combination. The introduction of the pictured primer book was based upon such views of the philosophy of the infant mind. And what was the picture presented by the Almighty in the gradual development of those oracles of which the Jewish nation was designed to be the repository? It was an altar—then a lamb—and then a Mediator. The whole was developed by pictures and symbols. What were the altar, sacrifice, lamb, and priest, but so many pictures presented to the mind? It was therefore necessary that God should proceed on this plan, and teach this people a new language, different from that in which Adam was instructed. It now became necessary that a language of symbols should be adopted; and for this purpose God presented these pictures to their minds. Hence, a house was erected and filled with these symbols. There was not a pin in that house, nor any article of furniture, nor any garment, nay, not a loop, or a button, that was not prefigured to Moses on Mount Sinai—and all exhibited to him, as Paul says, as *patterns* of things in the heavens. These their religion taught them to regard with the deepest reverence. But the Jews did not understand the import of the symbols which they thus reverenced; and this proves the absence of all fraud and collusion. If they had understood the meaning of these symbols, and could have reasoned clearly from them to the things symbolized, there might be some ground to suspect collusion. But the striking fact is, that the nation which built the temple did not understand the symbols which it contained; and nothing could open their understandings to the apprehension of their import until one stood in that temple and took the vail which separated the visible from the invisible, and rent it in twain; showing them afterward what Moses and the prophets did mean. If skeptics understood this, they could no longer doubt the truth of christianity. All plausible objections I am willing to examine; but those reasonings and speculations of Mr. Owen upon the social system are no more objections to the truth of christianity than are the Alleghany protuberances to the theory of the earth's sphericity. They are objections analogous in character to those of the old woman who would not believe in the revolutions of our planet because she never yet saw her garden turn round to the front of the house. There can be no substantial argument urged against the verity of these stupendous facts recorded in the annals of God's chosen people.

The existing observance of the Jewish sabbath is of itself suffi-

cient to silence all cavilers, and to convince every man capable of appreciating the weight of historic evidence, that there could not have been fraud, or collusion, or imposition, in the recorded facts concerning the origin and religion of this nation. This evidence, in my estimation, is invested with a solemn dignity, and I often regard it as the focus into which all the divine light of revelation is concentrated. Every part of the record conveys to my mind irresistible evidence that Moses was commissioned by God, and that the Jewish religion is a divine revelation.

MR. OWEN'S SEVENTEENTH ADDRESS.

My Friends—You see these two books which I hold in my hands; here is one, and here is the other; do these two books added together make three books or two? Now, do you suppose that if, after such demonstration as this, I were to preach to you for many years, I could ever succeed in convincing you that one added to one made three? Now, this is a fair illustration of the difference between Mr. Campbell's arguments and my own. I place most distinctly and palpably before you the fact that one and one make two—Mr. Campbell, in conformity with his early impressions, is exerting all his rhetoric to persuade you to believe that one and one make three; and this erroneous belief was forced into his mind by his early training and subsequent education—he could not avoid receiving it, and how can he help retaining it. He has truly, therefore, been using great ingenuity in attempts to convince you that facts are not facts, as we see them; but that one and one make three.

Let us, however, my friends, try and get back to the investigation of facts, for these alone can give us real knowledge. We will therefore proceed to the investigation of the sixth law of our nature, which is one of those divine laws that we are now to analyze, and which is moreover one of those stumbling blocks, one of those difficulties which Mr. Campbell cannot get over; one of those things which he calls *intangible,* because he can make no impression upon them.

This sixth law is, "That each individual is so created, that he must believe according to the strongest impressions that can be made upon his feelings, and other faculties, while his belief in no case, depends upon his will." Now, Mr. Campbell has very justly told you that religion is founded entirely upon faith, and thus we come in direct contact with each other. We cannot escape direct collision. When I once have ocular proof that one and one make two, there is no power on earth that can convince me they make *three.* After our ocular sense has become fully possessed of the truth of this simple fact, we may go farther, and say, that if all the divines and all the religions in the world were to say that one and one make three, we would find it impossible so far to control our will as to believe it. Now, when I know that I have not one particle of power over my belief; that what I shall be compelled to believe has never,

in the slightest degree, depended upon my will, how is it possible for me to believe that the being who formed me and created my nature, and subjected it to the resistless influence of this sixth law, can ever attribute either merit or demerit to any belief whatever? I could bring this discussion just now to a very short point, but I think it would be a pity to have it closed so soon. Now, the question is really this, Have we the power to believe or disbelieve at our will, or not? If we have not the power to believe or disbelieve at our will, then surely all religions are false and originate in ignorance. Now, if we have the power to will as we please, and if we have the power to believe at will, should Mr. Campbell, to whom we are already so much indebted, only have the kindness, in addition to his former good offices, to believe for five minutes that the whole of christianity is false, then I will admit that we have the power to believe at will. If Mr. Campbell, with all the energy of will which he can command, will only force himself to believe for five minutes that christianity is a fable and a falsehood, I will give up the contest, and admit that I have not proved my point. But, perhaps, this would be tasking his feelings and prejudices too severely; and therefore we will only ask him to be so kind as to believe just for a quarter of an hour that Mahomet was a true prophet sent of God.

But all jesting apart. Whenever we shall rightly understand this subject, and shall know what manner of beings we are, we shall discover that the question of religion or no religion, depends entirely upon our power of belief or disbelief. It is not a metaphysical question. Any one can ascertain the real merits of it for himself. If we have the power of changing our belief at pleasure, it is possible that religion may be true; but if the christian, like the Mahometan, is *compelled* to believe in his district religion, then religion must be false, and the first gleam of right reason which we shall acquire will show us the extent of the errors in which, on these subjects, the world has been involved.

I am willing to rest the merits of the whole controversy upon this single affirmative proposition, "That no human being ever had the power of belief or disbelief at his will, and therefore there cannot be merit nor demerit in any belief." This is now the isolated point of controversy between me and my opponent. This is the real battle-ground, and the only *arena* in which my friend and myself can engage in combat. Every discussion irrelevant to this point is a mere vain and useless multiplication of words to amuse our fancy, to darken our understanding, and to waste our time.

If any one in this assembly will come forward and adduce any fact to prove that you can at all change your belief, some system of religion or other may be true—but if you cannot adduce a fact of this character, your belief in religion proves you to be in the grossest darkness. Until you can trace the consequence which the acquisition of self-knowledge leads to, you can know nothing with regard to yourselves. Do you suppose that this self-knowledge will be injuri-

ous to you? No, my friends, "*Know thyself*" was the most heavenly precept the world has ever heard. It is the foundation, and the only possible foundation for a pure and genuine charity. Tell me another source from whence true charity can be derived. Where else will you look for the principles of a charity that "thinketh no evil;" that finds an immediate, rational, and consolatory excuse for the opinions manners, habits, and customs of all men, without one exception? If, therefore, you want to possess that which is truly divine, get this *charity* — a charity so pure that when you are trained in the full knowledge of it, no motive to crime will exist; no feeling of anger, irritation, or ill-will, on the part of any human being toward any other of his race. When we shall be trained in a full knowledge of the principles in which this beneficial, this admirable charity is founded, we shall, in consequence, have rational countenances, and not until then. Owing to the lamentably mistaken manner in which we have been trained, we are now filled with anger, and oftentimes with malevolent feelings against those who have been taught to differ from us in sentiment. What have I not heard the world unjustly say of me and of the motives which govern my conduct? But having had the knowledge of those principles given to me, on which alone true charity can ever be founded, I have listened to all these things as I would to words upon any other subject. I cannot, except for a moment, be angry with those who misconceive, misrepresent, or revile me; knowing that all these things proceed from an organization and local circumstances acting upon it, which create irrational prejudices. Where, therefore, is the rational pretext for being angry? From whence, then, under any circumstances, can arise the rational pretext, after consideration, for being angry, or displeased with any of our fellow-beings? They are coerced by a law which they cannot resist, to feel, to think, to act, and to *believe*, independently of their volitions.

These, my friends, are some of the practical results which I have experienced and enjoyed as the natural fruits of a knowledge of these divine laws of nature. The *charity* emanating directly from this knowledge, has given me a patience, an equanimity, and a self-possession, under a concurrence of *trying* circumstances that I am convinced no knowledge derived from any religious considerations could have implanted within me. Therefore, my friends, do not suppose that there is anything pernicious in *infidelity*, so called; for you may rest assured that the only practical, moral, or intellectual motives capable of producing important and permanent ameliorations in society, must be derived from what you have been taught to call *infidelity* — but most arbitrarily and irrationally taught. Not, my friends, that infidels of modern times, are much better than other folks, but the christian shoe has been unriveted from their minds, and thus they become so circumstanced as to stand some chance of arriving at the knowledge of the truth; while the true believers, on whose minds the shoe still remains fast riveted, are compelled to admit into them

many errors which give a false and injurious direction to their best feelings, while their noblest power, their faculty of judgment, is suffered to lie latent, torpid, buried, or misguided. My friends, would we not be better and happier beings, if we could remove far from us all anger and irritation?—and what can do this so effectually as the conviction that those who act in the most direct opposition to our notions of right, are not the objects of blame, but of our charity, our sincerest pity and compassion? To me the present appears a most singular era. The annals of the world do not afford a parallel to the assembly this day congregated in this place. Before me are hundreds collected together from various quarters of the world, who have all been trained in notions peculiar to themselves; and yet they sit here quietly and decorously to hear discussed doctrines in direct hostility to all their early-taught religious prejudices and opinions. This is the first time such a thing has occurred in the annals of history. If I had attempted fifty years ago to have addressed a popular assembly in the style that, prompted by a love of truth, and by the deep interest I feel in promoting the happiness of my species, I have ventured to do on this occasion, it is most probable I should have been torn to pieces; and yet I just as much deserve to be torn to pieces to-day, for speaking the truth without fear or favor as fifty years ago. The ignorance and bigotry of our ancestors were so gross, that if any individual had come forward with the purest and most philanthropic motives to promulgate the truths which you have heard from me in this place, he would most certainly have been burnt alive or torn to pieces. The advance of the human mind in certain branches of real knowledge, since that period, has produced this difference of feeling, and convinces me that we are approximating to a greatly improved period of human existence, call it, if you please, the millennium. What I mean to state is, that our minds are in a rapidly progressive state of preparation for the admission, discussion, comparison, analysis, and thorough comprehension of simple facts, a knowledge of which can alone produce intelligence, virtue, good feelings, and sincere affection among mankind. Indeed, I see very plainly every step of the practice by which this state of general happiness is to be attained. And the first preparatory step is, that all men should be disabused of the errors implanted by their early local circumstances and instruction, in order that their knowledge should be all founded in facts, and not derived, as now, from the imaginations of our ignorant ancestors, who were without the valuable experience acquired since their day. If I could so far impress upon the people of Cincinnati the value of the knowledge to be derived from the twelve fundamental principles of human nature, derived from daily existing facts, as to give them a sufficient degree of interest to examine whether they are true or false; my conviction is that a large majority, if not the whole population, would be convinced that they are true. It would not then be difficult to direct to the means by which you might all become virtuous, intelligent, independent, and happy. I do not

say that this change could be effected in you to the same extent that your adoption of these laws in practice would enable you to effect in your children. The latter would have so little comparatively to unlearn in habit, and to unassociate in their minds, that they would soon exhibit to you a state of human happiness and enjoyment of which it has never entered into the heart of man to conceive—and this happiness of theirs, after a short time, would be so strongly reflected back upon yourselves, that a large increase of happiness would accrue to you. My friends, this is no chimera existing only in my imagination. No ! I have seen with my own eyes this beautiful effect produced upon a whole population. I have seen the children of some of the most ignorant and deformed in their habits and conduct, more amiable, interesting, and happy, than the most sanguine could anticipate under the other injurious circumstances in which they were placed, and have *seen* that happiness and the influence of the superior characters which were formed *for* these children, most strongly and most beneficially reflected back upon their parents.

MR. CAMPBELL'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.

That my opponent labors under some sort of mental illusion is most apparent from his style of reasoning and argument. He has held two books before your eyes, and asked you if he did not hold one in either hand, and whether one plus one equal three ? Now, in the name of common sense, what bearing had this ocular appeal upon the subject matter in controversy ? What is the extent of the mental hallucination exhibited by Mr. Owen? It seems to me to be of a character with that of the herbalist, who would attempt to ascertain the specific gravity of his simples by the use of a yard-stick ; or like that of the vintner who should attempt to ascertain the number of cubic inches in one of his casks by the use of pounds avoirdupois. Of such a character is the illusion which perverts Mr. Owen's understanding. Is it an arithmetical question that we have before us ? Or are we to test the verity of historic facts by the use of mathematical demonstrations ? Have we uttered anything so absurd as the proposition that one book plus one book equal three books ? But what was the argument to which my opponent alluded as involving this absurdity ? So far from attempting any refutation of our arguments, I cannot discover that he makes the slightest allusion to them in his discourses. He does not deny that all religion is built upon faith. Now, is this proposition as contrary to the evidence of our senses, as that these two books make three books? I repeat that all religion purports to be established upon testimony : and I ask again, wherein is this proposition repugnant to reason ? Wherein is it assimilated to the proposition that one book added to another makes three books ? Why this is equal ingenuity to the boy who tried to convince his father by his logic that the two ducks on the table made three : and after the old gentleman had heard the demonstration, he said to the lad's mother, " Do you take one duck and I will take the

other, and *Bob* may have the *third* for his logic !" I am willing to concede to my opponent equal merit and reward for his logic ; but I protest against it as altogether impertinent to the subject-matter of this debate. Indeed, I apprehended, from the confidence of my friend's manner, when he held up the two books, that he was about to apply some touchstone, or test, whereby I might be discomfited; but what was my surprise at only finding myself opposed by this same old sixth fact ! And what is the mighty import of this sixth law? It does not even purport to be anything more than an assertion that our belief is independent of our volitions.

But my opponent seems to imagine that his bare assertion of this fact is sufficient to carry conviction to every mind. Mr. Owen has asked me to believe christianity untrue for five minutes. Now look at the illusion here. The question is not, *Are we able to disbelieve, or discard our pre-existing belief from our minds at will?* In order to see, it is as necessary to have rays of light as the organs of vision. Now if my opponent had asked me to believe for a moment that the sun was not now shining, and afterward triumphed at the impossibility of the thing, what would it all amount to? Would it prove that the fact of seeing was in all cases independent of volition? But I contend that our volitions have as much control over the mental as the corporeal eye. I admit that frequently our eyesight is, perhaps, involuntarily exercised. But from these *particular* premises, am I to argue to the general conclusion, that in no case whatever is my belief, or my vision, under the control of my volition. Have I not *documented* with proof that my belief in testimony is as much under the control of my volition, as are my acquisitions in any department of science ? I know, indeed, that if I am sitting in a room, and a person open the door, and suddenly present a monkey before my eyes, I cannot help seeing it. In like manner, a person may suddenly enter my room, and announce to me an interesting fact. From the high character of the narrator, and other adjuncts accompanying the fact, I may not be able to withhold my belief in it; but is it a logical conclusion from these *particular* premises, that I must necessarily, *in every instance*, acquire a knowledge of facts, and see monkeys without the least exercise of volition ? It is contrary to all correct principles of reasoning to argue thus from *particulars* to *generals*. Who does not know that we may occasionally acquire knowledge without the exercise of volition? But our acquisitions of information, made in this way, do not constitute a thousandth part of our stock of knowledge acquired in the ordinary natural way, viz : by a voluntary exercise of our senses. Mr. Owen cannot sustain his position , because, for one case which he may adduce wherein belief is exercised independently of volition, we can produce hundreds wherein it is exercised voluntarily.

But Mr. Owen affirms that this is not a metaphysical question : nevertheless a metaphysical question it certainly is. And yet my

friend says he will rest the truth of his theory upon a metaphysical discrimination.

[*Mr. Owen said*, "I contend that it is a question of *fact*, and not a metaphysical question."]

[*Mr. Campbell resumes*—]

Then, Mr. Chairman, it will be necessary to have a new vocabulary. But I am perfectly willing that the argument should be read by the public as my opponent has presented it. It will be for the public to decide whether it be metaphysical or not.

In the prosecution of my argument, I had advanced so far as to demonstrate, I trust, that the Jewish religion was divine, and that all its rites were in their nature *symbolical* and *prophetic;* that the sacrifice of a lamb, the building of an altar, the consecration of the priesthood, and the whole ritual of Moses were symbolical, and prophetic of christianity; that this ritual was designed to have a two-fold operation: first, upon the generation then living; and secondly, upon posterity. With the first to keep up the constant recollection of the divine institutions of their religion. Your children, says Moses, will ask you what is the meaning of your eating the paschal lamb; and then you must tell them the circumstances by which you became a nation. And such was the import of every one of the Jewish institutions. When they paid their five shekels per head for the redemption of the first-born, their children were to be informed that these first-born were the ransomed of the Lord; and this tribute was rendered in perpetual commemoration of that event. This is implied in the rendition of this tribute up to the present time. Their successors were also to be informed that the Pentecost was solemnly observed as commemorative of the promulgation of the law from Mount Sinai; the feast of the tabernacles for so many days to commemorate that they once dwelt in tents in the wilderness; that on the fiftieth day after their redemption they heard the voice of God promulgating the law—had seen all the accompaniments of the divine presence, and received the autograph of their constitution from the Lord.

All these things the children of the Israelites were to be taught; and they were so contrived as to be equally prospective and retrospective, so as to preserve and conduct forward the miraculous evidences of their religion. Hence the deliverance of the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, their Pentecost, and every part of their ritual, looked forward to, and anticipated a new state of things, in which a certain system of existing realities was to correspond with the past. Was there ever presented an exhibition of wisdom and evidence comparable to this? Every part of the ritual operates as a commemoration of its divine institution, and to produce faith in all future generations. It was designed to stand for a perpetual monument of their miraculous history to the nations; and its consummation in the development of that order which enters into the

constitution of the christian religion was as natural as the production of the bird from its shell. And thus the consummation of its every type is portrayed in the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ. On these accounts we consider these memorials as of high moral power and dignity, and the facts which they commemorate as rational and demonstrably established. You have seen what all the gatherings and gleanings of my opponent, during a period of forty years, have enabled him to bring forward against these evidences.

With regard to the means employed for the preservation and perpetuation of these holy oracles, there were not only the temple and tabernacle, but men set apart to take care of the record; and the necessity of their care emphatically impressed upon them. This was the way to preserve it from interpolation. No man dare touch it at peril of his life; and this is the reason why Uzzah was struck dead for touching the chest, in which was the sacred deposit, to represent the majesty of that power which guarded it.

Now, in process of time, the copy of this record began to be read in every synagogue. Their land, like other countries, in time, became too small for its population. In consequence, they emigrated, and carried with them their religion, their history, and law to the ends of the earth. These migrations caused the Jewish scriptures to be translated into the Greek language, about three hundred years before the birth of Christ. By the order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the whole writings of Moses and the Prophets were translated by seventy-two Jews, for the benefit of the foreign-born Jews, and of the proselytes made from other nations. Thus by this singular wisdom were these oracles handed to every nation under heaven; insomuch that the learned sages of Greece became conversant with these oracles. The Jews traversing all parts of the earth, carried along with them their religious peculiarities; thus all nations were called to bear witness to the truth of these sacred scriptures. This singular people, when contrasted with the philosophic nations of Greece and Rome in their notions of God, exhibit a phenomenon which can only be explained on the admission of a supernatural revelation being bestowed upon them.

The Greeks and Romans had cultivated philosophy very extensively. Their languages exhibit the most polished intellectual refinement, and express every ramification of human thought; they not only invented, but compounded and remodified words so that any idea whatever could be forcibly expressed thereby. They had cultivated science to an extent far beyond any other nations; but they had, nevertheless, a thousand foolish superstitions composing their mythology. But here were a people called Jews, ignorant of, and contemning philosophy, who considered the Greeks absolutely stupid and blind in matters of religion. Yes, the acute, the polished, and refined Greeks were sots in theological matters; but the Jews, destitute of philosophic taste and acquirements were never-

theless in possession of a religion every way honorable to the character of the Creator and Governor of the World. Now how is this to be accounted for? A polished nation, like the Greeks, embracing a system full of theological absurdities; and, on the other hand, the rude and unlettered Jews holding the only rational views of the Creator, and contending for the unity and spirituality of God!!

But this same people, being a traveling people, carried their oracles with them everywhere; and by this universal promulgation of them communicated to all nations the confident expectation that some wonderful person was to be born, through whose influence there was to be brought about a universal revolution in society; through whom a new order of things was to arise, and the world be blest thereby.—For this universal promulgation of the Jewish record, all nations fondly cherished the idea, that at the very time of the actual birth of the Messiah, a person in that character should appear in the land of Judea; the Roman Poet* sings of it; all nations had arrived at a uniformity and universality of anticipation in this matter, and in the reign of Augustus, there was not a nation which was not as fully prepared as the Jews to anticipate the advent of the Messiah.

MR. OWEN'S EIGHTEENTH ADDRESS.

My friends—As I mentioned this forenoon, I might, with safety, rest this portion of this discussion entirely upon the last law that I have read. My friend, Mr. Campbell, deems it a metaphysical question. I conceive it to be entirely a question of fact. And I think the whole point was conceded when Mr. Campbell discovered that he could not disbelieve christianity, or believe Mahometanism at will. However, it is necessary that the subject should be presented in every varied point of view, in order to enable men to unassociate their early implanted ideas opposed to it. Mr. Campbell was a little surprised to discover that this was one of the *old* laws of nature for which I have been contending; but truth is immutable; it is the same to-day that it has ever been, and will ever continue to be.—Therefore, in all future preachings, after the truth shall be clearly and fully developed, there will be no occasion to have any

Note by the Reporter.— The harmonious genius of the Mantuan bard, has taught us in all the charms of his exquisite muse, the expectations of the Roman world, upon this subject. A few years before the birth of Christ, VIRGIL sings of him like one inspired: "The last age (saith he) is at length arrived, predicted by the prophets of Cumæ. The great order of ages begins to circle anew; justice returns to the earth, and the peaceful reign of Saturn: and from heaven descends a new and divine offspring. He shall rule the tranquil world with his father's virtues. Soon the great months shall begin to roll on, and every vestige of our former crimes shall be effaced. Enter on thy mighty work, O son of Supreme Jove, dear offspring of the gods."

Late researches into the antiquities of Judea, Persia, and China, show that the same traditions and hopes existed in the most distant eastern nations.—Vide Asiatic researches, Indian antiquities. Pierre du Hold's History of China.

more texts of scripture than is contained in these twelve laws; for they will ever remain immutably true, and be a foundation for an ample code of moral law, sufficient to lead us unerringly to every beneficial practical result.

There were a great number of statements in Mr. Campbell's last half hour's discussion, which I might very easily refute; but as they do not in the least concern the true merits of the argument, I deem it an unjustifiable waste of time to do more than merely to mention them. For example, when Mr. Campbell said he could not avoid seeing the Sun, he committed a mistake; for he might shut his eyes, and then he could not see it.

The last law on which I commented, was that which declares that our belief is involuntary, and therefore all religions are untrue, as they presuppose our belief to be voluntary, or they are perfectly needless, and mean nothing. The next law is, that each individual is so created that he must like that which is pleasant to him, or that which produces agreeable sensations on his individual organization; and he must dislike that which creates in him unpleasant or disagreeable sensations; while he cannot discover, previous to experience, what those sensations shall be. A large portion of all the religions of which I know anything, presuppose that man is so created that he can love or hate at pleasure. Now the law of our nature is in direct contradiction to this notion. There are no individuals in this assembly who can like, be indifferent to, or dislike *me*, for instance, by any effort of the will, in opposition to the impression which all my proceedings have already made upon them. They are obliged to receive exactly the impressions which my exterior, my manners, and my whole conduct make upon their individual organization; and whether they like, are indifferent to, or dislike me, I cannot in consequence blame them. And when this principle of human nature shall be understood it will be discovered to be of the highest practical importance—it will tend (concurrently with the one immediately preceding) to implant and to root principles of kindness and knowledge so deeply in the human heart and understanding, that we shall, indeed, have unlimited charity for the whole family of men. Then, instead of being angry with our children when they have not affection for us, we shall scrutinize into the cause why they do not feel as much love as we wish them to entertain for us; and we shall look for that cause in ourselves. Instead, therefore, of scolding our children, or of quarreling with them, we shall devote our attention to self-examination, and be patient, calm, kind, and affectionate to them. This is another of those invaluable practical results which will be produced by our obedience to these laws of our nature. Then, my friends, we shall cease to blame our children for their feelings, their thoughts, or their actions. On the contrary, we shall be taught to know that we have efficacious means of correcting the defects of our children, whether organic or superinduced upon their defective organization, and this without the slight-

est emotion of anger or irritation. And a knowledge of these laws or principles will force the same rational practice from us to all the rest of our fellow-beings as well as to our offspring. There can be no error, no irrationality in any of our proceedings, when we understand these laws, and that knowledge will compel us to act upon them.

I have now, perhaps, proved sufficiently in detail, that all religions are founded in direct opposition to the facts which now exist, ever have existed, or can exist. I am, therefore, quite willing to rest this part of the subject upon what has now been presented to you to prove that all the religions of the world, in consequence of being altogether irreconcilable to the laws of human nature, are founded in the ignorance of man. The next part of my duty is to demonstrate that these religions are the true and only source of all the vice and misery which have been experienced in the world. The latter clause of the proposition is so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven with the former, that what proves the one must necessarily prove the other. From the facts exhibited to you, it has been demonstrated that all the religions of the world are directly opposed to the never-changing laws of our nature, and that which compels men to act unnaturally, must be a never-failing source of error, contradiction, vice, crime, and misery. In the nature of things, as we find them actually existing, no other result could arise. It is, perhaps, sufficient to observe, that all the religions of the world are unnatural, or contrary to the nature of man; to demonstrate the truth of all which I have undertaken to prove, when I show the facts, capable of hourly inspection, everywhere, that man is not the being that all these religions presuppose him to be. It is here, my friends, I take my stand upon all these important questions. And it is my deep-rooted conviction, after forty years of the closest investigation of this subject, that it is not in the power of any man living to prove any of these facts untrue, or any of the deductions from them erroneous. But you will ask me, How can religion be the source of vice? My friends, I have already told you that that which opposes the immutable laws of our nature, will be sure to be found, in its consequences, productive only of vice. Religion lays the foundation for hypocrisy, falsehood, and deception of every description. Your spiritual pastors tell you that you must believe according to their fanciful notions, and the laws of your nature are continually impelling you to rise up in rebellion against such instructions. No man likes to appear singular or disagreeable in the eyes of his fellows, and still less to have the means of his subsistence withdrawn from himself and family for expressing his thoughts; and therefore men are under a strong necessity to say they believe as their neighbors appear to believe, and to feel as their neighbors and friends think they ought to feel, and from this beginning a complicated system of falsehood and deception takes its rise. And whenever falsehood is thus implanted in our nature, it soon pervades the whole man, making

his whole life one continued lie to his genuine thoughts and feelings; his conduct and conversation are one continued lie against his nature; and thus there is an end to all real virtue among mankind. Virtue and falsehood, or deception can never exist well together. The religions of the world have produced such an accumulation of irrational habits, false notions, and bad feelings, arising from this, as circumstances now are, unavoidable hypocrisy, that we cannot be in the world without feeling the necessity to cover our real thoughts and feelings—without, in fact, living in an atmosphere of perpetual falsehood and deception. Our words, looks, and actions, are scarcely anything else but falsehood and deception. Who dares speak his real sentiments on the subject of religion and affections, without being subjected to injury in his reputation and property? Are not these fears sufficiently operative to deter men and women from speaking their real thoughts and feelings? Talk not to me of virtue so long as men and women are compelled, by the absurdities of your institutions and erroneous conceptions of all things around you, to be insincere in their language and deceptious in their conduct. Falsehood and virtue can never exist together; and now your whole system is false from its foundation upward. Every profession, trade or occupation, supports itself by its deceptions. Where are the individuals now to be met with who speak the language of truth and no other language to each other? Almost the first thing you are compelled to teach your children is falsehood and insincerity. Our language to our little ones, when they are about to speak the truth, is, "O my dears, you must not say this, that, or the other thing." The poor children cannot imagine why they should be inhibited from speaking the truth; and it is a system of severe training to the infant mind, before we can give children that degree of insincerity and deception which is necessary to constitute them what is called "rational in society." But I trust the time is fast approaching when no child shall be (as at present) systematically instructed in falsehood and insincerity—when there will not exist a motive for deceptious conduct or behavior.

Is it necessary for me to do more than to call your attention to the extent of falsehood, deception, and hypocrisy which is everywhere prevalent? Do you not find yourselves surrounded with these crimes from morning till night, and wherever you go? I appeal to your personal knowledge and experience, of what is passing in every department of life, and even in all the little coteries of my female friends. But when we discover that we cannot love or hate, believe or disbelieve at our will, I shall act openly, honestly, and consistently from the knowledge, no rational being will discover any motive for any kind of deception or insincerity. But at present we are not in a situation to incur the hazard incident to the speaking of the truth. What would be the consequences if all these young ladies now before me were to begin to speak the truth and nothing but the whole truth to-day? What would the staid and grave members of society say

about them? Why, that they were fit only for a lunatic hospital! So would they say of every man or woman that dared to speak the truth; and this derationalizing and corrupting effect has been produced by religion alone. It is by falsehood and deception of the grossest kind that all the religions of the world have been established, and by these arts they are now alone supported. Hypocrisy, deception, and falsehoods are the floodgates of every kind of vice. They destroy all confidence between man and man, and between man and woman, and they create a large portion of the most inferior and disagreeable feelings that can be implanted in our nature. They force us to suppress and disguise the expression of our feelings before the individual; but the moment his back is turned, we launch out with great latitude upon all his defects and peculiarities, not one word of which would we ever utter to his face. Such we know to be almost the universal practice of mankind. Now, simply because I have dared to speak openly exactly what I feel and think, for the benefit and happiness of my species, and thus to proclaim my convictions, and come forward and act upon them, I have been called a fool, a madman, fit only for a lunatic asylum. This has been my reward for having the moral courage to speak the simple truth as nature compels me to comprehend it; therefore, my young friends, you cannot, with safety, yet venture to speak out the truth; for if you do, you will assuredly risk confinement in a lunatic hospital!

It would require a great deal of time and reflection to trace and deduce all the other vices which necessarily flow from deception, hypocrisy and falsehood. I leave this to your imagination, because it has been well cultivated; but it would occupy too much time for me to detail them.

The next evil is disunion. All religions are peculiarly well adapted to disunite the human family. No device so effectual in its nature to create disunion among mankind as religion. At the same moment when a system was introduced and adopted, ascribing merit or demerit to any particular opinions, likings, or dislikings, was the foundation laid for all the dissensions among mankind, which have ever distracted the world. I need not, my friends, refer you to the religious wars and massacres of former times, or to the angry controversies of our forefathers, when they were debating what mysteries or absurd creeds should be devised to be forced into the minds of human beings from their birth; nor need I refer you to all the public calamities which religious dissensions have caused among various nations of the earth. I need only refer you to your own experience of the divisions and jarrings, bad feelings and passions, which occur in families and neighborhoods, solely because they cannot force themselves to think alike on the subject of religion. You find mankind everywhere herding in sects and parties, excluding from their fraternal sympathies, all who possess a different faith. These differing creeds form an impassable barrier to keep asunder the various

religious sects and parties. See how the christians and Turks are now contending against each other. Christianity arrayed on the one side and Mahometanism on the other. Why, my friends, tigers could not be more savage than they are, or *exhibit* conduct more irrational.

MR. CAMPBELL'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the document which I presented to Mr. Owen on the subject of his favorite position, would have merited his consideration; that the objections which I there offered to his favorite thesis would have *commanded* some attention; that before repeating, and rehearsing, and then re-reciting his twelve propositions, he would have made an effort to reply to these objections. But, instead of such an attempt, my opponent has repeated, almost verbatim, what he had antecedently told us at least three or four times. I must again solicit an exposition of some of the important terms which my opponent uses; for example, I solicit, and I have a right to claim from him, his definition of the term *fact*, the term *millennium*, and the term *heaven*. These are terms of very frequent recurrence in my opponent's vocabulary; and I think it more than probable that the ideas which we attach to these names differ, *toto cælo*, from those which are attached to them by my opponent. That knowledge, sincerity, and candor, which my opponent so much extols, would not appear disadvantageously in himself on this occasion. It is a disingenuous and unfair imposition upon us to use terms except in their current application, and according to their usual and most known signification. My opponent has given us a terrific picture of christianity. To the triumphs of christianity has he attributed all the insincerity, malevolence, and other vices of society. From the address which you have heard from Mr. Owen, you would naturally conclude, on opening the sacred volume, to find it filled with such beatitudes as these, Blessed are the slanderers, blessed the hypocrites; happy the liars, happy the miscreants. You would, from Mr. Owen's account of the book, expect to find, at least, one section inculcating such moral precepts as these: "Thou *shalt* kill, thou *shalt* commit adultery, thou *shalt* bear false witness, thou *shalt* hate thy neighbor, and thou *shalt* live in discord and dissension with thy fellows, and in the practice of everything calculated to destroy human happiness." If you pay any attention to Mr. Owen's libels on the scriptures, what else could you expect to find in them but benedictions of such import? He has, however, given us some idea of his standard of morality. After speaking of the mischievousness and hypocrisy of the priesthood, he tells us that he would not displace them. He would have these priests supported in their lying and deceptious trade, lest this projected revolution should deprive them of bread. He has told you that you ought not, yet awhile, to tell the truth, if you expect to be tolerated in society. By his own showing, such are my opponent's views of morality and

sincerity. So much in passing, with regard to Mr. Owen's last address.

In the prosecution of the argument we have before us, we have arrived at that period of Jewish history which gave to the whole world (Jews and Greeks) the oracles containing the religion which Moses taught the children of Israel. We have alluded to the effect which the dissemination of these oracles produced. We have noticed the universal anticipation of a new order of society—insomuch that this Messiah might be called, as he is in ancient prophesy, the "*Desire of* ALL *nations.*" This is the very name which the ancient prophet Haggai so significantly and so emphatically bestows upon him. But it was now become necessary that these oracles should be universally disseminated, in order to produce such a desire as this. When we come to speak of the *prophesies*, we shall more fully show that such was the universal desire and expectation, and that it sprang from this source. Before concluding our remarks on the historic evidences of the Jewish religion, we asserted yesterday that these historic records of the Old Testament were not only written and read to the whole congregation of Israel by Moses, that an exhortation founded upon them was delivered, *viva voce*, and afterward written by Moses, during the last month of his life, called Deuteronomy, and deposited in the sacred chest; but also, that there are in the histories of the world, remotely as they penetrate, so many allusions to these records, as to render it almost absolutely certain, even upon Pagan testimony, that these writings are genuine, and were received and venerated by the nation, from the earliest notices of them as a people.

It is, however, enough for us to affirm, that there is no counter testimony in the world. There is no way to set aside historic testimony, except by adducing counter testimony of greater validity. The skeptics have been called upon for their counter testimony. They have been coolly and calmly requested to search the annals of the world, in order to produce it. They have been asked whether it was possible that the Egyptians and Israelites could have existed together, and such stupendous miracles falsely asserted concerning the manifestations of divine wrath against the Egyptians, and of divine favor toward the Israelites; and yet no document can be found to contradict them. The skeptics have been repeatedly challenged to this investigation. But you may search all the skeptical books in the world without finding even an attempt to produce such testimony. But we are not only able to produce these documents and these *criteria*, as sufficiently attesting the truth of these historic facts, but we can also show from all ancient history, that there are many references and allusions to facts mentioned in them, which, in their direct tendency, go to attest the verity of the Mosaic account. We shall just take a peep into the most ancient Greek historians, and see whether they furnish any data confirmatory of the historical records found in the book of Genesis.

It is universally admitted by Deists, Atheists, and all, that the Bible is the oldest book in the world. No counter testimony can then be brought against the facts related in the most ancient parts of the Jewish history. But we will here attempt to show, that all the ancient historians which peep into the depths of remote antiquity, do, in all their allusions, confirm the sacred history.

1. *All the Greek writers acknouledge and represent Egypt as the most ancient and best policied empire in the world.*

This is confirmed by Moses. So early as Abraham's time we find a regular dynasty of the common name of Pharaoh. This kingdom (Gen. xii, 15.) is represented as abounding in corn and having a surplus.

It appears, from the princes of Pharaoh's court, his princely presents to Abraham, and his retinue of state, that his court at that time had attained to great splendor.

From the caravans of Ishmaelitish merchants who traded in spices, much used in embalming the illustrious dead, and the slaves which they carried down for sale, it would appear that the Egyptians at that time were refined in the arts of opulence and splendor.

From the standing militia, the chariots, and the cavalry, too, in Egypt, the time the Hebrews were in bondage, in building treasure cities, it appears that the Egyptians were very far exalted above all the nations of the earth in the time of the Pharaohs. The Greeks were entirely unskilled in cavalry until long after the Trojan war.

2. But not only do the ancient Greek writers speak of the magnificence of the Egyptian empire in that early period, but also in detailing the civil and religious institutions of that people they afford additional evidence of their high advances in all the arts of refinement.

Of the *priesthood*, Diodorus Siculus thus writes: "The whole country being divided into three parts, the first belongs to the body of the priests, an order in the highest reverence among their countrymen; for their piety toward the gods, and their consummate wisdom, acquired by the best education and the closest application to the improvements of the mind. With their revenues they supply all Egypt with public sacrifices. They support a number of inferior officers and maintain their own families, for the Egyptians think it utterly unlawful to make any change in the public worship, but that everything should be administered by their priests in the same constant and invariable manner. Nor do they hold it at all decent that those to whose care the public are so much indebted should want the common necessaries of life. For the priests are constantly attached to the person of the king as coadjutors counselors, and instructors, in the most weighty matters. For it is not among them as among the Greeks, where one single man or woman exercises the office of the priesthood. Here a number are employed in sacrificing and other rites of public worship, who transmit their profession to their children. This order, likewise, is exempt from all charges and imposts,

and holds the prime honors under the king in the public administration."

Herodotus, also, to the same effect, testifies. He observes: "Of all the colleges of the priesthood, that of Heliopolis was the most famed for wisdom and learning." Strabo also declares that in his time very spacious buildings yet remained in Heliopolis, which, as the reports ran, was formerly the residence of the priests, who cultivated the studies of astronomy and philosophy.*

N. B. The Egyptian word *chohen*, which the Chaldaic paraphrast translates *princeps*, and which seems to be the same as the Samothracian *coes*, denotes both a *prince* and a *priest;* this is explained by the fact that the privy counselors of the ancient kings of Egypt were priests, and were therefore called princes; and as Pharaoh intended to place Joseph at the head of the nation, he could not have allayed the envy and prejudices of the priests and privy counselors, better than by causing Joseph to marry the daughter of the priest of Heliopolis, in Hebrew, *On*.

The priest of Heliopolis was the most illustrious of the order; for as Diodorus Siculus informs us, the sun and moon were the first gods of Egypt; and this city of the sun was so called because he was principally worshiped there; and as Strabo informs, the priests studied astronomy. The theology of the Egyptians made it peculiarly fitting that the priests who resided at Heliopolis should direct their attention to this subject naturally and religiously. The Egyptians taught either out of reverence to their chief god, the sun, or from astronomical observation, that the sun was the center of the whole system. From Egypt, Plutarch, in his history of Isis and Osiris, says that Pythagoras obtained this knowledge from Œnuphis, a priest of On, or of Heliopolis, the city of the sun.

3. *The religious rites of the Egyptians*, as described by the Greek historian, is another proof corroborative of the Mosaic account. Herodotus expressly tells us that the Egyptians held it a profanation to sacrifice any kind of cattle except swine and bulls, clean calves, and geese, and that they hold heifers, rams, and goats sacred; for at this time, the Egyptians had not deified animals. This explains Moses' saying, "It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the abominations of the Egyptians to the Lord our God; so shall we sacrifice the abominations of Egypt before their eyes." Herodotus informs us that such impiety was punished with deadly hatred by the Egyptians.

4. *The civil rites of the Egyptians.* Concerning the practice of physic, Herodotus says it was divided among the faculty thus: Every distinct distemper had its own physician, who confined himself to the study and cure of that, and meddled with no other; so that all places are crowded with physicians; for one class had the care of the eyes, another of the teeth, another of the body, and another

* Warburton, vol. 2, page 33.

of the occult distempers. From this account, it does not appear strange that Moses represents the household of Joseph as well replenished with physicians. "And Joseph commanded his servants, the physicians, to embalm his father; and the physicians embalmed Israel."

There is also a remarkable allusion to this practice of the Egyptian skill in Jeremiah, when that prophet foretells the overthrow of Pharaoh's army at the Euphrates: "Go up into Gilead and take balm, O virgin, the daughter of Egypt! In vain shalt thou use many medicines; for thou shalt not be cured." The same prophet, under the same figure, alludes to the Egyptian superstition in his own time. He says, "Egypt is like a fair heifer, but destruction comes from the north; also her herdsmen are in the midst of her, like fatted bullocks, for they also are turned back and fled away together." The allusion here is most apparent to the worship of Isis and Osiris, under a cow and a bull — the most celebrated of all the Egyptian ritual.

The medical profession, naturally and according to history, is divided into surgery, and pharmacy, and the dietetic practice. Surgery was naturally the most ancient; pharmacy was next to it, and the dietetic the last. Hence physic must have been far advanced in Egypt at the time to which Diodorus alludes.

5. *The funeral rites of the Egyptians* are thus described by Herodotus: "Their mourning and funeral rites of sepulture are of this kind: when a principal person dies, all the females of that family besmear their heads and faces with loam and mire; and so leaving the dead body in the hands of the domestics, march in procession through the city with their garments close girt about them, their breasts laid open, beating themselves and all their relations attending. In an opposite procession appear the males, close girt likewise, and undergoing the same discipline. When this is over, they carry the body to be salted— there are men appointed for this business, who make it their trade and employment; they first of all draw out the brain, with a hooked iron, through the nostrils. After this they hide it in niter for seventy days, and longer it is not lawful to keep it salted.

Diodorus Siculus agrees with Herodotus in all the essential circumstances of mourning and embalming, except he varies in one particular: he says they anoint the whole body with gum or resin of cedar and of other plants, with great cost and care, for above *thirty days;* and afterward seasoning it with myrrh, cinnamon and other costly spices, not only to preserve the body for a long time, but to give it a grateful odor; they then deliver it to the relations.

All this scripture history confirms and explains; and does more— it reconciles the two Greek historians concerning the *number of days* during which the body was in the care of the embalmers. Moses says, "And the physicians embalmed Israel; and forty days were fulfilled for him, for so are fulfilled the days for those who are embalmed; and the Egyptians mourned for him threescore and ten

days." Now we learn from the two Greek historians that the time of the mourning was while the body remained with the embalmers, which Herodotus tells us was *seventy days*. This explains why the Egyptians mourned for Israel threescore and ten days. During the time the body lay in niter, and when in the compass of thirty days this was reasonably well effected, the remaining *forty* of Diodorus were employed in anointing it with gums and spices to preserve it, which was the proper way to embalm it; and this explains the meaning of the *forty* days which were fulfilled for Israel, being the days of those which were embalmed. Thus the two Greek writers are reconciled, and they and scripture are mutually explained and supported by each other.*

By the way we may remark, that the infidel objection against Joseph for making the free monarchy of Egypt despotic, is without foundation. The law-giving power Pharaoh did not transfer, but reserved it in his own hands in these words: "*Only on the throne will I be greater than thou.*" Joseph, as prime minister, administers justice; but Pharaoh guards to himself the prerogative of giving law. In commanding the people to give their money, cattle, and lands to Pharaoh, it is reasonable to conclude that the law emanated from Pharaoh.

In one sentence, we may affirm that the farther we penetrate into remote antiquity, the more reason we will have to place implicit confidence in the divine mission of Moses.

MR. OWEN'S NINETEENTH ADDRESS.

My friends: Mr. Campbell has very correctly informed us that the christian scriptures do not in direct terms command us to tell lies, to steal, and to commit all sorts of crimes. But if we are told to do one thing, and circumstances of our nature irresistibly compel us to another thing directly opposed to the precept, we are by such precepts compelled to speak falsehood continually. The fact can be easily established, that throughout all christendom there is very little truth spoken between man and man; and it is the christian religion which has created the christian character. I am told that truth is much more generally spoken among the Mussulmen than among the christians; but there can be very little truth spoken by either party. I recommend to my young female friends here not to speak the truth upon many subjects most interesting to their happiness through life, because, if they did, they might lay their account in meeting all manner of persecution and inconvenience. Nor did I recommend in a preceding address that the gospel ministers of the present day should be paid for disseminating and perpetuating falsehood, which, to my certain knowledge, many of the most learned and enlightened of the cloth know and believe to be such. I meant simply to give utterance to a great principle of justice; to state that those who had been trained to the gospel ministry were compelled, by circumstances,

*Warburton's Divine Legation, vol. 2, pp. 46, 47.

to adopt that course of life; and I have no doubt that a very large portion of them adopted this course most conscientiously; therefore I deemed it unjust that the great and overwhelming change in society anticipated and predicted by me should deprive any man of his livelihood. But if, as I confidently expect, these principles shall rapidly pervade society, another and a better employment will be assigned to the reverend clergy. They will then become the most efficient and useful oracles to promulgate and expound the divine laws of human nature, and demonstrate their high importance in producing irresistible motives to virtue from their pupils; and after much calm deliberation I am quite sure that this will be the most economical and by far the best mode of disposing of the whole body of the clergy. It will not only be the most economical, equitable, but also the most beneficial for themselves and all mankind. I have told you that it will not be necessary to deprive any individual of his present support in order to effect these anticipated changes; because there exists in society an artificial producing power almost immeasurably beyond the wants of man. Although still rapidly and annually increasing, this artificial producing power is even now, if it were well understood and rightly directed, greatly beyond our wants—it is already far more than equal to the supplying of every child that shall be born into the world a most ample store of everything that is best for human nature. But before this change can commence, we must discover the true principle and the true bond of social union—for most true it is, that there can be no real substantial happiness and improvement in the constitution and frame of society, until men do really and strictly learn to love one another. But have the different religions inculcated in the world yet enabled you to love one another? In this very city are you not calling yourselves the friends and acquaintances of each other, and at the same time striving and contending against each other as if you were avowed and professed enemies.

Where is the mercantile man to be found, who, if he learns by some private intelligence that certain articles of merchandise will greatly enhance in value, will not go to his dearest friend and buy all that he has of those articles, at the lowest price he can procure them. Now this is very loving to be sure!

We are deceived by high-sounding, empty words, and the present state of commercial society is anything but rational; and all society, from the highest to the lowest, in all countries, is becoming commercial, and daily more and more ignorantly selfish. Our circumstances compel us to become covert enemies to each other. Instead of endeavoring to promote each other's happiness, we are straining every nerve to take from others, in order to add superfluities which we cannot enjoy to ourselves. Does not the christian religion in many other ways create dissensions among men? What say ye to this, ye people of Cincinnati? Are all the religions of this city united heart and soul together? are there no divisions among them?

are they always willing to accommodate each other? are there not divisions and dissensions among those who are designated by the same name, and classified as belonging to the same sect? Are there no dissensions among the Baptists, the Quakers, Presbyterians, nor among the Episcopalians? My friends, there is nothing but dissensions and divisions under the present system, from one end of it to the other; dissension pervades the whole mass of society—it leavens the whole lump; and as the march of mind advances, these dissensions will increase, and be the cause of their ultimate overthrow. They have increased already to that extent that those who understand the signs of the times see plainly that, erelong, religion must receive its death-blow. Instead of a system which derationalizes the human race, other times are approaching when we shall have our attention and our faculties directed to what we can comprehend—to the acquisition of real knowledge, and to the investigation of the laws of matter; and, my friends, for us to attempt the investigation of any other laws but *material* laws is every whit as futile as an attempt to fly from the earth to the sun. Depend upon it that you only waste your time in such searching after immaterial things; such search can only lead you into the wildest regions of the imagination, and then you will find it very difficult to get back again into the paths of common sense. Therefore, I strongly recommend to those who wish to acquire real knowledge, not to sacrifice their time in speculations upon subjects beyond the comprehension of human faculties.

When we direct our attention to an investigation of the laws of nature, no quarrels are originated; and why? because we can recur to facts; we can re-examine and discriminate by the *criteria* of real knowledge the truth from error. We may say, indeed, that the present era is the commencement of a search into the real nature of existing facts which will bring about the *millennium*, by which term I simply mean a rational state of social existence, in which sincerity and candor shall universally prevail—when, through a knowledge of facts, human nature will be laid open to that extent that we shall know ourselves and know our fellow-beings even as we are known. But the only way to commence this rational state of existence, is, to lay a solid foundation for genuine charity and social affection; and there are no principles under heaven that can guide us to these desirable results unless it be the knowledge that we have no will, power, or control in framing our belief on any speculative subjects, and no free agency or volition in the matter of our likings or dislikings. These are the only sure foundations for a genuine love and universal charity among mankind. When these admirable principles, old as they are, shall begin to be comprehended, love and charity will be sure to extend themselves even unto the uttermost part of the earth. Let but these twelve laws be once generally understood, and I know of no motive which could actuate any human being to enter into strife and contention with, or to think or feel

uncharitably toward, any of his species. Therefore, my friends, by discarding the practices of the wild imagination of our easily deluded ancestors, in which all the religions of the world have had their origin, and which they have forced into our minds by the means of the mutual laws which I have explained, you will in lieu thereof adopt the laws of nature for your guides; and these will always lead you to the best and most rational practice that can be adopted—a practice of those amiable virtues and that genuine charity which will better prepare you for heaven, if you are destined to go there, than anything that has yet been taught you, or than anything that has yet been done for you; and I cannot conceive it possible that a life approaching to what is represented by your spiritual teachers to be a heavenly conduct here, can unfit those who have had this foretaste of heaven in this life for the enjoyment of a superior existence hereafter. But, my friends, I have not the remotest idea that in a future state of reanimation we shall retain the least consciousness of our former state of vitality. My investigations on this subject have convinced me that it is a speculation in which no man ever has or can arrive at anything tangible. I believe that in one sense we shall live forever, for I cannot suppose that the particles of which we are compounded have ever been out of existence. It seems reasonable that the material particles of which we are composed are uncreated, that is, that they belong to the original stock of matter which forms the universe. In my judgment, there is nothing so absurd as the supposition that a particle of matter could be created out of nothing. If you are prepared to swallow such an absurdity as this, you may swallow a *camel* or anything else. I have said that to me it appears the greatest of all impossibilities, that one atom of something could be created out of nothing; but it also appears to me an equal impossibility that one atom of matter consisting of something can ever be reduced to nothing. I conceive, therefore, that the *supreme power* consists in the indestructible vitality pervading the whole material universe, and that each particle of this universe contains within itself everlasting and unchangeable laws; and it is by the action, the harmony, and the co-operation of these laws, that all composition, decomposition and recomposition in the universe are effected. Let us not, therefore, waste our valuable time about spiritual nonentities which cannot interest us; but let us rather diligently apply all our faculties to discover the yet unknown laws of our nature, by which we shall ascertain the means to make our species as happy and prosperous as the materials of which we are organized will permit. If we will adopt this course of practice, and strictly adhere to it, I can see nothing that can possibly prevent our attainment to a very high degree of physical and intellectual perfection and happiness. I have now perhaps given sufficient details to prove that all religions tend directly to produce vice and disunion among mankind. I have now to show that they produce the natural consequence of vice and disunion, viz: *misery*.

The errors which the various religions of the world have, for ages past, forced into the minds of the human race, have been the cause of all the poverty which now exists in the world; and these religions have generated this poverty in two ways: first, by creating universal disunion among men, so as to prevent the possibility of any cordial co-operation for their reciprocal benefit and advantage; and secondly, by reason of the very large appropriations of the time and gains of the people, which the clergy, like the Levites of old, have engrossed to themselves and their mysterious, and, therefore, useless objects.

I discover from Mr. Campbell, that the Levites could not be contented with less than one-half of the property of the whole nation. Now it really does appear to me, that a society which could permit a small select tribe to appropriate to their own use one-half of the whole revenue of the nation, and allow that tribe to form and keep the records of their mysteries, and even to make it a capital crime to approach the sacred chest which contained them, must be in the extreme of ignorance and easily duped. I must also say, that, under such circumstances, there never was a set of men who had a finer chance of manufacturing and perpetuating fables to suit their own purposes, and of obtaining the means to degrade and enslave their fellow-beings, than had this same tribe of *Levi*. There is nothing more true, my friends, than that religion has been the primary cause of all the poverty that has for ages past afflicted the world. You have all of you received your religious notions at an age so early that your reasoning faculties have been thereby not only injured, but, in the majority of cases, destroyed to an extent which cannot be estimated or understood by the great mass of the present adult population. In consequence, the mind of man, instead of being rationally directed to discover what is best for human nature, has been so perverted as to consider the acquisition of wealth as the grand *desideratum*, and to appropriate millions to themselves while their fellows were starving around them, as the *summum bonum* of human felicity. Now it was my lot to commence the world with no property at all; and since that time I have experienced as gradual a change of fortune upward as most individuals, but I never found that I enjoyed happiness as wealth increased, or in proportion to any expenditure. I never found that I could eat, drink, or sleep any more in a state of affluence, than when through my own industry I procured the simple necessaries of life in comfort. But I found by experience, that when I had the most wealth I had the most care and anxiety. I have lived on intimate terms with some very wealthy men—some of them possessing a property estimated at several hundred thousand, and millions sterling. These men I have studied closely, and I think them and their families less happy than many whom I have known with little more than barely sufficient to supply the necessary wants of life. If it were not for the aberrations of the human mind, originating in the errors of religion, we should

soon discover the means of creating and enjoying an ample supply of the best of everything for human nature, and of cultivating our physical and intellectual faculties to a comparative high degree of perfection.

MR. CAMPBELL'S NINETEENTH REPLY.

If we be mere particles of matter, self-existing, or derived from the great whole, or entirely material, springing from the earth and returning thereto again, and that the less of this world's goods we have the better—let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.

I must correct an allusion of my opponent to the Levitical priesthood. I observed that the consecration of this priesthood was designated to be the most effectual commemorative monument, because it was compelling the passions of the people to attest and perpetuate the remembrance of the fact of their redemption from Egypt. The destroying angel passed over the land, and destroyed the first-born of man and beast belonging to the Egyptians, and the Israelites to a man escaped. To perpetuate the memory of this, God claimed the first-born of that nation in all time coming. Subsequently, in lieu of the first-born, one tribe of the twelve was set apart. This tribe was to receive so much real estate, and be supported by the whole nation. And I have asked, Would any nation, except under divine coercion, have submitted to such an exaction as this upon their time and their real and personal property? [*Mr. Owen says, Yes, all nations have done it.*] Mr. Campbell resumes—I have asked if any nation would have submitted to such a heavy taxation as this in support of their religion, had they not been absolutely certain of its divine origin and authority? Mr. Owen says, Yes, they have all done it. Well, now this assertion will not prove that the first nation did it without a divine authority. They set the example—and we can easily test the principle whether nations will, without good reasons, submit to such imposts, by bringing the case within our own experience. Let, then, such an experiment be attempted in this country, and it will soon be discovered that it would be impossible to induce us to support a religion so onerous, without affording the most incontrovertible evidence of its divine authority. Mankind part with money and property for religious uses only when conscientiously convicted of a divine obligation. To exact it from them without presenting some plausible grounds for such authority, requires compulsion. And however easy it may be to perpetuate such a usage, it never could have commenced without the strongest evidence of divine authority. But to test this matter, I appeal to universal experience, and to the impossibility of instituting such a custom now.

I protest against Mr. Owen's objecting to any part of these writings as fact, without acknowledging the whole of them as fact. Does he believe that there was an Aaron or a tribe of Levi? If so, *on the same authority* he must believe that there was a Moses and

twelve tribes, led by him through the Red Sea. It is unfair to garble the document, admitting the truth of one part and objecting to the truth of another. He must take it all or none. Does my opponent believe that there were Levites; that there were a Moses, an Aaron, and a Levitical priesthood; that the nation were convened at Sinai, received the law there attested, and that there was a place of deposit, a sacred chest, first in the tabernacle and then in the temple, containing a copy of this law? Does he believe these things? And if he does, why not believe all the other facts? I repeat that it is neither a fair nor a manly style of reasoning, to take a part of these facts and found arguments upon them, without receiving the whole.

Mr. Owen has given us his definition of the term *millennium*, but will give us no definition of *fact*, and says he knows nothing about heaven—neither will he take any notice of the document which I presented to him. I wish you to bear in mind that he pretermits all notice of this document.

Fact is derived from *factum*. It means *that which is done*. Now it is not a fact that I have two eyes. This is not a *fact*, but a *truth*. It is a fact that I rose up or sat down. Anything I may have *done* is a fact. No speculation can be a fact. It may be a fact that a man expressed such an opinion; but the opinion itself is no fact. It is a fact that Mr. Owen conceived these twelve positions, wrote them, expressed or read them; but the twelve opinions, assertions, or propositions are not facts.

Christianity is a positive institution—an institution built upon facts. So was Judaism. The christian facts are all matters of record. The record of testimony is the object of faith. Hence faith requires testimony, testimony concerns facts, and facts require a witness. The historian records facts. The philosopher speculates upon opinions or abstract truths. Mr. Owen's system is the system of a philosopher; it is not the work of a historian. He confounds speculations, assertions, laws of nature, and facts; and from a fondness for the term *fact* he calls all his views *facts*. His propositions may or may not be *truths;* but *facts* they cannot be. If I could correct Mr. Owen's misapplication and erroneous use of this single term, it might tend to dissolve the charm, and dissipate the illusion which his sportive fancy throws over all his lucubrations.

There are yet remaining a few documents which I desire to read, in further support of the proposition that the Jewish scriptures are corroborated by all ancient historic writers. There is not only no counter testimony, but a strong concurrence of testimony in attestation of the facts recorded by Moses. We penetrated into very remote antiquity, in order to illustrate this accordance, and we proved that Herodotus and Diodorous Siculus are reconciled by a reference to Moses; and that these three writers mutually explain and support each other.

There is one consideration which is worthy to be kept continually

before our minds in this investigation, and that is, the advanced state of civilization in the country when the Jewish religion was first propounded. We must bear in mind that Moses was surrounded by acute, learned, and sagacious enemies, when he led the children of Israel out of Egypt. But we must go further back into antiquity in order to show that the most ancient traditions confirm the Mosaic account of the creation, deluge, etc.

"As to the history of Berosus, the substance of it, as it is given us by Abidenus Apollodorus and Alexander Polyhister, is to this purpose: That there were ten kings of Chaldea before the flood; Alorus, Alasparus, Amelon, Amenon, Metalarus, Daorus, Aedorachus, Amphis, Oliartes, Xisuthrus. That Xisuthrus was warned in a dream, that mankind was to be destroyed by a flood on the 15th day of the month Dæsius, and that he should build a sort of ship, and go into it with his friends and kindred, and that he should make a provision of meat and drink, and take into his vessel fowls and fourfooted beasts; that Xisuthrus acted according to the admonition; built a ship, and put into it all that he was commanded, and went into it with his wife and children, and dearest friends. When the flood was come, and began to abate, Xisuthrus let out some birds, which finding no food nor place to rest upon, returned to the ship again. After some days he let out the birds again, but they came back with their legs daubed with mud. Some days after, he let them go the third time, but then they came to the ship no more. Xisuthrus understood hereby, that the earth appeared above the waters, and taking down some of the boards of the ship, he saw that it rested upon a mountain. Some time after, he, and his wife, and his pilot went out of his ship, to offer sacrifices to the gods, and they were never seen by those in the ship more. But the persons in the ship, after seeking him in vain, went to Babylon. The Xisuthrus here mentioned was evidently Noah. And Berosus supposes from Alorus to Xisuthrus ten generations, and so many Moses computes from Adam to Noah."*

This is the Chaldean history concerning their own nation. They wished to trace themselves up to the commencement of time, and gave an account of the ten patriarchs before the flood, making Noah one of their kings.

"The history of Sanchoniatho is to this effect: That the first mortals were Protogonus and Æon; that by these were begotten Genus and Genea; the children of these were Phos, Pur, and Phlox; and of these were begot Cassius, Libanus, Antilibanus, and Brathys. Memrumus and Hypsuranius were descended from these, and their children were Agreus and Halieus; and of these were begotten two brothers, one of them named Chrysor and Hæphæstus; the name of the other is lost. From this generation came two brothers, Technites and Autochthon, and of them were begotten Agrus and Agrotus;

* Shuckford's Connection, vol. 1, p. 41.

Amynus and Magus were their children, and Misor and Sydec were descended of Amynus and Magus. The son of Misor was Taautus or Tyoth. This is the Phœnician genealogy of the first ages of the world, and it requires no great pains to show how far it agrees with the accounts of Moses. The first mortals mentioned by Sanchoniatho, and called Protogonus and Æon, were undoubtedly Adam and Eve; and his Misor, the father of Taautus, is evidently the Mizraim of Moses. From Protogonus to Misor, Sanchoniatho computes eleven generations, and from Adam to Mizraim Moses makes twelve; so that Sanchoniatho falls short of Moses only one generation, and this, I conceive, happened by his not having recorded the flood."*

"The Chinese have been supposed to have records that reach higher than the history of Moses; but we find by the best accounts of their antiquities that this is false. Their antiquities reach no higher than the times of Noah, for Fohi was their first king. They pretend to no history or memoirs that reach up higher than his times; and by all their accounts, the age of Fohi coincides with that of Moses' Noah. Their writers in the general agree, that Fohi lived about 2952 years before Christ. The author of *Mirandorum in Sina et Europa* computes him to reign but 2847 years before our Savior; and Alvarez Sevedo places his reign not so early, imagining it to be but 2960 years; and all these computations agree well enough with the times of Noah; for Noah was born, according to Archbishop Usher, 2948 years, and died 2016 years before Christ; so that all the several computations about Fohi, fall pretty near within the compass of Noah's life. But we shall hereafter see many reasons to conclude Moses' Noah, and the Chinese Fohi, to be the same person."†

"The first king of China was Fohi; and as I have before observed that Fohi and Noah were cotemporaries at least, for there are many reasons, from the Chinese traditions concerning Fohi, to think him and Noah the same person. First, they say Fohi had no father, *i. e.*, Noah was the first man in the post-diluvian world; his ancestors perished in the flood, and no tradition hereof being preserved in the Chinese annals, Noah, or Fohi, stands there as if he had no father at all. Secondly, Fohi's mother is said to have conceived him encompassed in a rainbow; a conceit very probably arising from the rainbow's first appearing to Noah, and the Chinese being willing to give some account of his original. Thirdly, Fohi is said to have carefully bred seven sorts of creatures, which he used to sacrifice to the Supreme Spirit of heaven and earth; and Moses tells us that Noah took into the ark, of every clean beast by sevens, and of the fowls of the air by sevens; and after the flood Noah built an altar, and took of every clean beast, and every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings. Fourthly, the Chinese derive the name of Fohi from his oblation; and Moses gives Noah his name upon account of the grant

* Shuckford, vol. 1, p. 42. † Ibid. vol. 1, p. 48.

of the creatures for the use of man, which he obtained by his offering. Lastly, the Chinese history supposes Fohi to have settled in the province of Xeusi, which is the northwest province of China, and near to Ararat, where the ark rested."*

We would occupy (said Mr. Campbell) many hours in the production of such documents as these, which are the most ancient in the world, all corroborating the Mosaic account:

"Not only has it proved impossible to overthrow any of the numerous facts which the scriptures record, but, on the contrary, they are confirmed, in a very striking manner, by the traditionary accounts of all nations.

"In answer to Mr. Hume's assertion, that the books of Moses are 'corroborated by no concurring testimony,' Dr. Campbell replies—'As little, say I, invalidated by any *contradictory* testimony; and both for this plain reason, because there is no human composition that can be compared with this in respect of antiquity. But though this book is not corroborated by the concurrent testimony of any coeval histories, because, if there ever were such histories, they are not now extant; it is not therefore destitute of all collateral evidence. The following examples of this kind of evidence deserve some notice. The division of time into weeks, which hath obtained in many countries, for instance, among the Egyptians, Chinese, Indians, and northern barbarians—nations whereof some had little or no intercourse with others, and were not even known by name to the Hebrews—the tradition which in several places prevailed concerning the primeval chaos from which the world arose—the production of all living creatures out of water and earth, by the efficacy of a Supreme Mind—the formation of man last of all, in the image of God, and his being vested with dominion over the other animals—the primitive state of innocence and happiness—the subsequent degeneracy of mankind—their destruction by a flood, and the preservation of one family in a vessel. Nay, which is still stronger, I might plead the vestiges of some such catastrophe as the Deluge, which the shells and other marine bodies that are daily dug out of the bowels of the earth, in places remote from the sea, do clearly exhibit to us. I might urge the traces, which still remain in ancient histories, of the migration of people and of science from Asia, (which hath not improperly been styled *the cradle of the arts*) into many parts both of Africa and Europe. I might plead the coincidence of these migrations, and of the origin of states and kingdoms, with the time of the dispersion of the posterity of Noah.'

"Respecting the division of time into weeks, Dr. Campbell remarks, 'The judicious reader will observe, that there is a great difference between the concurrence of nations in the division of time into weeks, and their concurrence in the other periodical divisions, into *years*, *months*, and *days*. These divisions arise from such natural

* Shuckford, vol. I, p. 82.

causes, as are everywhere obvious; the annual and diurnal revolutions of the Sun, and the revolution of the Moon. The division into weeks, on the contrary, seems perfectly arbitrary; consequently, its prevailing in distant countries, among nations which had no communication with one another, affords a strong presumption that it must have been derived from some tradition (as that of the creation) which hath been older than the dispersion of mankind into different regions."

"To this last article may be added, that the whole of the fifteen southern constellations yield their testimony to the ten first chapters of Genesis. First the constellation of the Ship: secondly, the Altar, with its vast body of fire and smoke ascending near the Triangle, the remarkable Egyptian symbol of Deity: thirdly, the Sacrificer: fourthly, the Beast about to be sacrificed: fifthly, the Raven: sixthly, the Cup of libation: seventhly, eighthly, and ninthly, the greater and lesser Dog, and the Hare, situated so near to Orion, the great and iniquitous hunter both of men and beasts. The whole of the remaining constellations of the southern hemisphere are composed of aquatic objects or animals, and may be considered as pointedly allusive to a general deluge.

"Traditions more or less distinct, which corroborate the facts recorded by Moses, and which prove the common origin of mankind, are found, on the whole, to be uniform in all parts of the world. They have not only been verbally handed down, but have subsisted in the religious observances and practices of all nations. These are not confined to the old world, but extend also to the new. The first discoverers of America observed there a reverence for the Sabbath, and an acquaintance with many of the appointments of the Mosaic institution, and of the early history of the world. "The contents of some of their manuscripts are curious in a high degree. One is a cosmogony, which contains a tradition of the mother of mankind having fallen from her first state of happiness and innocence; and she is generally represented as accompanied by a serpent. We find also the idea of a great inundation overwhelming the earth, from which a single family escaped on a raft. There is a history of a pyramidal edifice raised by the pride of men, and destroyed by the anger of the gods. The ceremony of ablution is practiced at the birth of children. All these circumstances, and many more, led the priests who accompanied the Spanish army at the time of the conquest, to the belief, that at some very distant epocha, christianity, or at least Judaism, had been preached in the new continent. I think, however, says Mr. Humboldt, I may affirm, from the knowledge we have lately acquired of the sacred books of the Hindoos, that, in order to explain the analogy of these traditions, we have no need to recur to the western part of Asia, since similar traditions, of high and venerable antiquity, are found among the followers of Brama, and among the Shamans of the eastern Steppes of Tartary."

"The institution of sacrifice, which, to Mr. Hume appeared

absurd, and which certainly did not originate from what is called the light of nature, has been found in every part of the world.

"Whether we consult the religion of the Greeks, the Goths, or the Hindoos, we everywhere meet with a mediatorial deity, engaged in combat with an envenomed serpent. And a belief that the place of punishment is full of serpents, equally pervades the Gothic, the Persian, and the Hindoo mythologies. Can any one imagine that such unlikely combinations, unaccountable except on the ground of a common descent and revelation from God, for instance, that of a Triune God, could have accidentally found a place among men originally separate and remote from each other?

"Traditions have been traced over the globe of the creation—of the Sabbath day — of Paradise—of the fall of man — of the serpent—of the promised Messiah—of Cain and Abel—of the longevity of the Patriarchs — of the number of generations between Adam and Noah—of the Deluge—of the dove sent out by Noah—of the rainbow as a sign—of the number of persons preserved in the ark—of Noah and his three sons—of the tower of Babel—of Sodom and Gomorrah, with a variety of circumstances respecting these particulars.

"The great tower in the temple of Belus at Babylon, is supposed to have been the same which was built there at the confusion of tongues. As described by Strabo, it was one of the most wonderful works in the world. Although it fell short of the greatest of the Egyptian pyramids (which was a square of seven hundred feet on every side, while this was but of six hundred), yet it far exceeded it in the height; the perpendicular measure of that pyramid being four hundred and eighty one feet, and that of the tower six hundred. It is particularly attested by several authors to have been all built of bricks and bitumen, as the scriptures tell us the tower of Babel was. Herodotus says that the going up to it was by stairs on the outside, round it. When Alexander took Babylon, Calisthenes the philosopher, who accompanied him hither, found they had astronomical observations for 1903 years backward from that time; which carried up the account as high as the one hundred and fifteenth year after the flood, which was within fifteen years after the tower of Babel was built.

"Concerning Sodom and Gomorrah, Tacitus relates, that a tradition still prevailed in his days, of certain powerful cities having been destroyed by thunder and lightning; and of the plain in which they were situated having been burnt up. He adds, that evident traces of such a catastrophe remained. This historian concludes with expressing his own belief in this awful judgment, derived from an attentive consideration of the country in which it was said to have happened. In a similar manner Strabo, after describing the nature of the lake Asphaltis, adds, that the whole of its appearance gives an air of probability to the *prevailing tradition*, that thirteen cities, the chief of which was Sodom, were once destroyed and swallowed

up by earthquakes, fire, and an inundation of boiling sulphureous water.

"The account which Lucian (a professed scoffer at all religions, who lived in the second century), has given of the tradition of the flood, in his Dialogues, is as follows: Having visited the temple of Hierapolis, he says, 'The popular story is, that this temple was founded by Deucalion, the Scythian, in whose time the great flood is said to have happened. I was no stranger to the account of it by the Greeks, which is as follows:' 'Not one of us now living is descended from the original race of men, who all perished; and we, numerous as we are, are no other than a second race sprung from Deucalion. The Aborigines, we are informed, were apt to be very arrogant, full of mischief, and continually transgressing the laws, inhospitable to strangers, deaf to supplications, and would say or swear anything, in which offenses they were overtaken by the severity of justice. The earth on a sudden opened its sluices, heavy showers of rain came down, the rivers swelled, the sea rose till the waters everywhere prevailed, and every mortal was drowned except Deucalion alone, whose discretion and piety were such that he was spared and became the father of a new generation. Having a large chest, he put his wives and children in it, and then went into it himself; which was no sooner done, than there came to him boars, and horses, and lions, and serpents, and in short every species of land animals, all in pairs. He took them all in; and Jupiter had ordered it so, that they neither did him nor one another the least injury, but lived and sailed together in perfect harmony, during the continuance of the flood, all in the same chest.' 'This I was told by the Greeks. In addition to which the Hierapolitans relate, that a large chasm was provided in their country to absorb the water; and that Deucalion, after seeing it thus disposed of, raised altars and built a temple to Juno, over the chasm. It was but a small hole in the earth when I saw it; but how much larger it might have been formerly, when it held so much, I cannot take upon me to say. However, as a proof of what they advance, water is brought twice in the year, from the sea to the temple, not only by the priests, but from the whole country far and near, by Syrians, Arabians, and great multitudes beyond the Euphrates. It is emptied in the temple, and runs into the opening below, which, small as it is, takes in such a quantity as is truly amazing. This, it seems, was a law of Deucalion, to perpetuate the memory of his deliverance from the general calamity.'

"Various Pagan historians speak of Moses, the lawgiver of the Jews: Diodorus Siculus calls him a man of most superior wisdom and courage. He mentions the departure of Israel from Egypt; of their advancing into Palestine, and seizing upon a number of cities, particularly Jerusalem. He speaks of their worship, their tribes, their code of laws, by which they were kept separate from every other people; of the priesthood appointed in one family; of judges, instead of kings, being appointed to decide all controversies among

them; of the superior authority being vested in the chief priests; and that Moses concluded the volume of his laws with claiming for them divine inspiration. Strabo also mentions various particulars respecting Moses. Eupolimus likewise celebrates him as being the first wise man, and the inventor of letters, which the Phœnicians received from the Jews, and the Greeks from the Phœnicians."

MR. OWEN'S TWENTIETH ADDRESS.

My friends: Mr. Campbell put to me yesterday one or two questions, to which he requested a reply. One of these questions was *whether I believed in the testimony of history?* Now I believe the historical fact recorded in Roman history, that Cæsar conquered Pompey, and that Cæsar was assassinated in the senate-house; and I believe a certain number of the prominent and leading facts of all histories which seem to be generally attested, and upon what is deemed the best authority that can be obtained, when not opposed by the divine laws of human nature. But I do not believe much of the details of either profane or sacred history. I know how difficult it is for individuals to go away from this meeting and relate facts precisely as they occurred here. Then what degree of faith can we have in narratives put upon record many years after the facts which they relate are said to have happened, and every conceivable opportunity and motive to falsify them? I therefore believe but few of the facts related in history, where the historian attempts to penetrate into the motive of the actors; for almost all the proceedings of men have been secret measures, of the real motives to the performance of which the public knew nothing, or were grossly deceived. I know of nothing more fallacious in its nature than history, sacred or profane; and when opposed to the known laws of nature, their testimony, however testified, is of no value whatever. It is a sure sign, when these are received with authority, that early erroneous impressions have not been obliterated.

Mr. Campbell's next question to me was, What is a *fact?* I replied that a fact was anything which exists. Mr. Campbell says that it is not a fact that he has two eyes; but it surely is a fact that he has two corporeal eyes. It may be a fact, with regard to our mental vision, that we may not have two eyes; for, most unfortunately for many of us, we have not yet been enabled to see with more than half an eye.

Some gentleman, to me unknown, has handed me a note, which I will read:

"*Mr. Owen: Was man originally created or uncreated?*"

Now, my friends, when I can answer this question, I can answer every other of a similar mysterious nature. I do not know whether an original man was created or not. And I do not think it is of much consequence to any of us that we should know the fact. As soon as we shall have facts to enable us to form a rational conjecture upon this topic, it will be time enough to discuss it.

Yesterday I was obliged to conclude my address in the midst of my endeavors to explain to you the facts which compel me to believe that the religions of the world are the cause of almost all its sufferings. The sufferings produced by religion are all those which emanate from falsehood, deceit, and hypocrisy, from poverty, and from disunion arising from a difference of feelings, opinions, and interests. But the sufferings arising from these causes, the genuine fruit of all religions, are tolerably applicable to the common affairs of life. But not so when compared with the miseries experienced by so many human beings from a disappointment of the affections, or from a deep conviction that they are not sound in the true faith; and that from the advanced state of their minds in the knowledge of some facts, it is impossible to become so. And thus, with the fear of hell and eternal punishment continually before their eyes, they are made as miserable as human nature can endure this side of madness; or, until after many years of suffering, insanity comes to the relief of their nature; for "a wounded conscience who can bear?" All these sufferings are produced solely by religion; and if you wish details of the overwhelming afflictions arising from a system which exacts a compulsory belief, I will refer you to the proceedings on the subject of religious belief in the early ages—to the horrors of the Inquisition—to the burnings which have taken place in christendom, even in England—and to the numerous receptacles for mad persons to be found at this day in every part of the civilized world; to say nothing of the annual murders perpetrated under the chariot-wheels of Juggernaut, or upon the funeral pile of the *Suttee*. In the course of my travels I have uniformly taken occasion to inquire of the superintendents of lunatic asylums what was the most fruitful source of insanity; and they have invariably informed me that it was overexcitement of mind on the subject of religion—that religious insanity constituted by far the most numerous class of cases. In reply to the question, What was the next most fruitful source of mental alienation? they have told me that it was the disappointment of the affections. Such have been the consequences of attempting to compel men to think that they were culpable on account of their thoughts, belief and opinions, never yet under the control of their will, or for their likings or dislikings toward their fellow-creatures, which were equally forced upon them by the laws of their nature. Many in this assembly have, I doubt not, experienced grievous suffering in consequence of having been trained in these pernicious errors; whereas, had you been trained to have rational views upon these subjects, you would just as soon have thought of tormenting yourselves because you were not six feet high. There is just as much reason and common sense in attempting to compel men and women to be of the same height, as to endeavor to make them think and feel alike upon subjects not resting upon certain and unchanging facts.

I have only laid before you a few, out of the innumerable reasons

which might be adduced to prove that the religions of the world have been the real cause of the vice, disunion, and unhappiness which now pervade society; and that it has been, mediately or immediately, directly or indirectly, the real cause of all the evils with which the human race has been afflicted. We come now, my friends, to the fourth division of our subject, which is, if I recollect aright, that "the errors in which all religions are founded, are the real cause which now prevents the establishment over the earth of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity in its most genuine sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family." And, my friends, if religion be the only obstacle to such a happy consummation as this, it is surely high time that this obstacle were removed. "*What is virtue?*" is another question which has been put to me. Virtue, my friends, according to the best idea I can form of it, is that course of conduct which promotes most effectually the happiness of man individually and collectively; and vice is that course of conduct, which, by the laws of man's nature, tends to keep him in ignorance, and to render him, individually and collectively, unhappy. Now, the whole course of my reading, reflection, and observation—of my knowledge of man, derived from extensive travel, and observation of the animal man in his various *phases*, and from intimate communication and interchange of intelligence with the first minds I have been able to meet with—all these reasons concur to impress upon my mind a resistless conviction that the only barriers now existing in the way of the establishment of a virtuous, happy, and rapidly progressive state of society, are the religions now taught in the world. To me it appears the essence of folly to suppose that there can be real virtue among a people taught to believe that they have the power of controlling their belief, and of liking and disliking at their will. These two errors, so long as they remain the paramount circumstance in forming the mind and feelings of the human race, must ever present an impassable barrier to our progress in the paths of virtue; nay, while these errors continue to be impressed on the infant mind, real virtue must remain hidden from man. These two pernicious errors engender all falsehood, deception, and hypocrisy. These are, indeed, the natural and necessary fruit of the tree—and where there is falsehood and deception, there can be no virtue; and where these errors exist, truth cannot be known; and, in consequence, your present state of society is built altogether upon falsehood and deception. Where there is disunion of feeling and sentiment there can be no more than the appearance of virtue; and religion compels you to imbibe, at a very early age, the sole cause of this disunion of sentiment and feeling, and to regard it as a virtue. When and where has there ever been harmony and unison of opinion on the subject of religion? So well is this understood among the most enlightened and refined circles of society, that they have tacitly entered into a convention never to broach the subject of religion, so well is it known to the intelligent and best educated part of the

European population, that the discussion of religious topics tends, for the time, to render the parties beside themselves or partially insane. They generally establish it as one of the rules in their learned societies, for the improvement of the human mind in real knowledge, that religion shall *not* be introduced. In those minds in which there is not a pure, a genuine or universal charity, derived from a clear and distinct knowledge of the laws of human nature; which excludes not a single individual of the human family, from our kind feelings for their happiness, there can be no virtue. And where is the religion that does not in its immediate, direct, and necessary tendency, steel the heart of man against the admission of this universal charity? I can command no language sufficiently expressive of the strength of my conviction, that religion locks up the heart of man and renders it impenetrable to the reception of a single charitable feeling for those who are opposed to their religion, or most ennobling sentiment, are not materially injured by it. To what country shall I betake myself, in order to find true *charity*, which is the most rational, amiable, and beneficial quality of human nature? Has it ever been, even to the present hour, allowed fair play? Had it not been checked in the bud by religion, it would have been the most natural and the most general attribute of human character. But as the character of man has been formed by the religions of the world, is this pure charity, or even the semblance of it, to be found in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America? I have sought for it everywhere as the pearl above all price, but nowhere can I find it, or even trace a faint resemblance to it. I have long since abandoned the search, for to find it where any religion prevailed, I discovered was utterly hopeless. This divine charity, to be derived only from an accurate knowledge of the laws of human nature, never has existed as a virtue to any people from the beginning of time. How was it to be produced? Can doctrines which teach that man can believe or disbelieve, love or hate at pleasure, teach charity? To expect the tree of religion, my friends, to produce the fruit of charity, were just as irrational as to expect "figs from thorns, or grapes from thistles." There can be no real virtue, where there is not kindness and affection existing among the population—but where shall we look for this? The society of Friends have made the nearest approximation to it that I have yet seen—but have they been able to attain to this indispensable prerequisite for virtue and social happiness? No, my friends, with the most ardent desire on their parts, the society of Friends have not been able to attain this happy state of individual and social feeling. They have failed entirely; and why? Because there can be no real affection, kindness, or benevolence of feeling, among the members of any class, sect, or party, who are trained in the notion that they can believe or disbelieve, like or dislike at will. No, to search after a virtuous population, while these pernicious and fundamental errors are taught to the people, will be only to waste our time. Then, my friends, if you really wish to be virtuous, and

to have kind and affectionate feelings one toward another; to acquire the feelings of a pure and genuine charity, that shall perpetually exclude from your bosoms every unpleasant and unkind feeling toward any of your brethren of the human family; the very first step that you must take is to discard and to reject all the religions of the world, together with all those errors which these religions have forced into your minds. When you can effect an amalgamation between oil and water, you may expect to find real virtue and religion co-existed in the same people. A population virtuous, and at the same time religious, never has existed; and, if I know anything of the constitution of human nature, never will exist. And as to our progress in improvement in intelligence in other matters, it has been made unaided by system in opposition to the established and prevalent systems of religion in the place where the improvements were made. Religions in general set no value upon real, or what they term worldly knowledge.

Among every population over the world in which any religion has acquired the full ascendancy over the minds of the people, there, as a necessary consequence, have young, old, and middle aged been plunged in the darkest night of ignorance. How, indeed, is it possible that religion and intelligence ever can exist together? The one has its source in the wildest fancies of a romantic and overstrained imagination—the other is derived from fact, and is founded in real knowledge, and discoverable only by the clear light of natural revelation. If the christian religion had not induced and sustained and continued the dark ages, as they are called, how different would have been the state of the world, during that period, from what we learn from history it has been and from our experience it is now? Why, my friends, under a rational system, founded on the obvious laws of nature, it will be easy in practice to give more knowledge requisite to happiness to a population in ten years to come, than the world has been permitted to acquire in the last two thousand years. If, therefore, we are ever to become a people truly intelligent, our first preliminary step must be to discard all religions and the incalculable errors of every description which they have engendered. It is religion, my friends, which destroys all our reasoning faculties, and conjures up phantoms to affright and confound all the human faculties. Were it not for the degrading and debasing effects of the various religions of the world, bowing down the minds of mankind to receive the teachings of a few ignorant mortals, who pretend to instruct them in, to them, inconceivable heavenly mysteries, children, by the time they arrive at the age of ten years, might with ease to their instructors, and great delight to themselves, be trained to the acquisition of more knowledge than is at present possessed by any priest, or all the priests in the world. Then, my friends, we come next to that charity which it is necessary to possess in devising a system for the education of children; and the only barrier that I know of, to the introduction of the most necessary charity, is religion.

But so long as religion is tolerated, this charity also, can find no resting-place upon earth.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWENTIETH REPLY.

"A copious history of the Jewish legislator is given by Antapanus, in which the oppression of the Israelites; the flight of Moses into Arabia, and his subsequent marriage; a circumstance similar to that of the burning bush; his divine commission to deliver his countrymen; the transformation of his rod into a serpent; the various plagues of Egypt, the spoiling of the Egyptians; the passage through the Red Sea; the destruction of Pharaoh and his host; and the support of the Israelites by manna in the wilderness, are all mentioned. He is further said to have been the person whom the Greeks call Museus, the preceptor of the celebrated Orpheus. The same author asserts that the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea was not unknown to the Heliopolitans, who gave the following account of that supernatural transaction. 'The king of Egypt, as soon as the Jews had departed from his country, pursued them with an immense army, bearing along with him the consecrated animals. But Moses having, by the divine command, struck the waters with his rod, they parted asunder, and afforded a free passage to the Israelites. The Egyptians attempted to follow them, when fire suddenly flashed in their faces, and the sea, returning to its usual channel, brought a universal destruction upon their whole army.'

"The circumstance of the Egyptians being struck with lightning, as well as being overwhelmed by the waves, is mentioned in the 77th Psalm, although unnoticed in the Pentateuch.

"Diodorus Siculus relates, that the Ichthyophagi, who lived near the Red Sea, had a tradition handed down to them through a long line of ancestors, that the whole bay was once laid bare to the very bottom, the waters retiring to the opposite shores; and that they afterward returned to their accustomed channel with a most tremendous revulsion.

"Even to this day, the inhabitants of the neighborhood of Corondel preserve the remembrance of a mighty army having been once drowned in the bay which Ptolemy calls Clysma.

"The very country where the event is said to have happened, in some degree bears testimony of the accuracy of the Mosaical narrative. The scriptural *Ethen* is still called *Etti*. The wilderness of *Shur*, the mountain of *Sinai*, and the country of *Paran*, are still known by the same name; and *Marah*, *Elath*, and *Midian*, are still familiar to the ears of the Arabs. The grove of Elim yet remains, and its twelve fountains have neither increased nor diminished since the days of Moses.

"The names which are assigned by Moses to eastern countries and cities, returned to them immediately from the patriarchs, their original founders, are for the most part the very names by which they were anciently known all over the East; many of them were after-

ward translated, with little variation, by the Greeks, into their systems of geography. Moses has traced in one short chapter, all the inhabitants of the earth, from the Caspian and Persian seas to extreme Gades, to their original, and recorded at once the period and occasion of their dispersion.

"The late Sir William Jones has very satisfactorily traced the origin of all the people of the earth to the three roots, Shem, Ham, and Japhet; according to the account given in the 10th chapter of Genesis. The fact mentioned by him is worthy of remark, that the first dynasties of Peruvian kings are dignified exactly as those of India are, by the name of the Sun and Moon.

"Sir William Jones has shown, that the traditions of the present heathen nations of Asia are not of more ancient authority than the traditions of the ancient nations of Asia and Europe. "States and empires," he says, "could scarcely have assumed a regular form till fifteen or sixteen hundred years before the christian epoch; and for the first thousand years of that period we have no history unmixed with fable, except that of the turbulent and variable, but eminently distinguished nation descended from Abraham.

"The Chinese themselves do not pretend that any historical monument existed among them, in the age of Confucius, more ancient than 1100 years before the christian epoch.

"The dawn of the true Indian history appears only three or four centuries before the christian era; the preceding ages being clouded by allegory or fable."

"Truth is always consistent with itself, and acquires an accession of evidence from everything with which it stands connected. It is not only beyond the power of perverted ingenuity and learning to invalidate the truth of the facts recorded in the earlier parts of the scriptural history, but they are confirmed by the traditions of all nations in a manner the most indubitable."*

We have now, we presume, exhausted your patience on this dry but still interesting part of the argument. We predicate nothing of these documents further than this, that, so far as the antiquities of nations have descended to us, there is corroborative evidence of the Mosaic account, and not a single testimony against it.

There is more absurdity in my friend's last address than could, perhaps, be disproved in a week. I have enumerated fifty-four distinct assertions adduced in his last address, and in the same space of time I could utter fifty-four entirely distinct from my opponent's.—But what would be the results, what the convictions arising from such a style of disputation. If this is to pass for argument, demonstration, or proof among the skeptics, I think their case is indeed irremediable. Men do, indeed, talk of reason, and eulogize her, and compare her with christianity; but I have uniformly remarked that skeptics, after a few compliments to their goddess at the threshold,

* Haldane's Evidences, p. 179—194.

afterward treat her with great neglect. I had intended to-day to present a recapitulation of my argument, and of my opponent's also; but on examination I could not find that he had advanced a single new idea. I could discover nothing but what he has already more than once presented. He has only given us another revisal of his divine code. In reiterating this code he did, I acknowledge, pass a few compliments upon the general character of man. We have been told, among other things, that we have not rational faces; that there are few indices or proofs of any sort of reasoning powers exhibited in any christian community; and to christian communities he ascribes all the vices of the world. For what purpose should I attend to such a style of argument? No good could result. By recognizing it as worthy of notice I should be deprived of opportunity to advance any good arguments in favor of christianity. On Mr. Owen's principles he can commit no sin against decorum or anything else. He cannot recognize any being taking cognizance of his motives against whom he can sin. He acknowledges no responsibility to any tribunal, none to the moderators, none to the audience. Upon his own principles he cannot sin, and is, therefore, incapable of conviction upon our premises.

Yesterday we were told that we were neither more nor less than mere particles of matter; consequently, that there is no such thing as either virtue, religion, or morality, in the common acceptation of those terms. I know that the terms *heaven, divine law, religion, virtue*, and *morality*, are occasionally used by Mr. Owen. But in what sense or application he uses them is not known. We have called upon him repeatedly for a definition of these terms. Surely it must be known to Mr. Owen, that in argument definitions must be settled. Now I would ask this audience if they have any idea of what Mr. Owen means by virtue? What are his ideas of virtue? What virtue can a being who is altogether material possess? Why, he tells us that it is to pay a just regard to our passions and feelings; or, in other words, that a virtuous course is that which secures to us the greatest amount of animal enjoyment. So that virtue, with Mr. Owen, is nothing more than a new name for appetite gratified; and his morality is nothing more than the capacity to minister to animal enjoyment. This is most unquestionably what Mr. Owen means by virtue and morality.

In regard to the term *fact*, Mr. Owen repeats that "*anything which exists is fact.*" Now I believe I hold mere verbal criticism in as slight regard as most men, but by this loose method of defining terms and using them, it is impossible ever to arrive at a logical conclusion. We asserted yesterday that *whatever is done* is a fact, but that nothing which is not done can be called a fact. This I affirm is the true import of the term. In common parlance we use this and other terms vaguely; but when we come to logical and philosophical discussion, this will never do. If it be necessary in mathematics to have a strict definition of our terms, it is equally necessary here.

What is the difference between a fact, a truth, an opinion, and a belief? Why, there is just as distinct a meaning annexed to these terms in my mind, as to the eye, the ear, or any other organ or member of the human body. The term *truth* is the most general and comprehensive of all. We have logical and mathematical truths, and so on through the whole circle of the sciences; and it means no more than a co-existence and consentaneousness with the thing of which it is affirmed. When facts are called stubborn things, which are to revolutionize the world, it is surely necessary that we should understand the import of the term; but here we are at issue—Mr. Owen says a fact is that which *exists;* on the other hand, we affirm that a fact is that which is *done*. Now, according to Mr. Owen's definition, everything that has any existence, real or imaginary, is a fact. If a house is composed of fifty thousand bricks, it is composed of fifty thousand facts! It is *true* that I have two eyes; but in the legitimate use of terms, it is not a *fact*. It is a fact that Mr. Owen has addressed you; that he has exhibited his twelve laws several times; expounded and applied them. But their existence upon that paper is not a fact. It is a fact that they were written, read, and explained; because all these things were *done*. Historic facts are those which have been done in former times, and put upon record.

After my opponent's definition of the term *fact*, he was pleased to admit that he had some credulity; that he believed that Julius Cæsar was assassinated in the Capitol, and that this same Cæsar conquered Pompey. He also admitted that he believed some other facts in Roman history. He believes in the existence of an inquisition, of the cruel persecutions of the Puritans, and he believes in the practicability of instituting a new social system, which is to revolutionize the world; these are facts which he says he believes. Now take the most notorious of these facts, viz: That Cæsar was assassinated in the senate-house, and let him produce the evidence on which his belief rests. I say, let him produce the historic evidence on which he rests his belief in this fact, and I will produce a hundred-fold more historic evidence of every species to prove that Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

My friend is himself a striking contradiction to his whole doctrine of circumstances, because we see him before us such a being as it is impossible his circumstances could ever have formed. His views, sentiments, feelings, and whole course of conduct are antipodes to those of men reared and trained under circumstances of the same character with his own. What, I should like to be informed, has distinguished Mr. Owen from his neighbors? He has asserted that our faith is entirely involuntary, and that our volitions have nothing to do with our belief; but he has just shown you that he disbelieves his own sixth law. He has the most voluntary kind of faith I ever knew. He wills to believe all history that reflects any stigma upon nominal christians—the cruelties and persecutions practiced by

pretended disciples of him who prohibited all violence, cruelty, and revenge; he wills to believe certain matters of fact from Roman history. The rest he wills to disbelieve.

The reason why I have not replied to the calumnies cast by Mr. Owen upon the christian religion, is, because we thought them unworthy of a reply. But Mr. Owen ought to come to close quarters, armed with the artillery of his twelve facts. In order to bring Mr. Owen to close quarters, I presented him with a written outline of my exceptions to some of his most important facts, or laws of human nature, or whatever he may prefer to call them. This paper Mr. Owen has not condescended to notice. I shall, therefore, take the liberty to read it to you, in order that you may judge for yourselves whether it merits the contempt with which it has been treated. You will then judge whether Mr. Owen, as a philosopher, is not bound, and especially on the ground he has assumed, to discuss the merits of the document presented.

EXTRACT FROM MR. OWEN'S LAWS OF OUR NATURE.

"6. That each individual is so created, that he must believe according to the strongest impressions that can be made on his feelings and other faculties."

"9. That the highest health, the greatest progressive improvements, and the most permanent happiness of each individual, depend, in a great degree, upon the proper cultivation of all his physical, intellectual, and moral faculties and powers, from infancy to maturity; and upon all those parts of his nature being duly called into action at their proper period, and temperately exercised according to the strength and capacity of the individual."

NOTES UPON MR. OWEN'S SIXTH LAW.

The object of this law is to prove man a necessary, and, therefore, an irresponsible agent.

☞Belief must, in all cases, be the effect of testimony, as knowledge is of experience; which latter is always, and in all cases, the proper and necessary effect of sensation, perception, memory, and consciousness; or, is the necessary result of one or more of these faculties. Wherefore, unless we confound belief with knowledge, it has nothing to do with our sensations or feelings, whether external or internal feelings; but depends entirely upon testimony—of the validity of which reason is the sole and competent judge. But, suppose with the said law, that "our belief has no dependence upon our will"—What then? How does this affect our responsibility, to destroy which, is the obvious design of said law? Is not *will*, or *volition* the last practical act of the mind—the determination of the mind to action, whether internal action or external? Is it not the effect of appetite—of affection—of passion—of judgment? And although it may proceed from any one, or more, of these motives; yet, in rational creatures, ought it not to be always under the control of reason—of judgment? And if we judge or reason rightly, accord-

ing to the documents within our power, we will necessarily *will* to do what, upon the whole, appears right, or preferable to do. And this we will most certainly do, if we possess the documents of christianity, and act accordingly. For it is axiomatically right for the rational creature to love, adore, and obey its Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and gracious Benefactor, to whom it stands indebted for everything enjoyed or promised. These things being so, the only necessity the rational creature is subject to, according to its nature, is to act right; that is, according to the best documents which are within its power, or of which it can avail itself. To act thus, would most certainly be to act circumstantially right; than which, no rational creature can act better, and, in the case supposed, would inevitably lead to piety, temperance, justice, and charity;—would infallibly secure benevolence to all, according to our ability and their necessity, etc. Now, if to these happy results of the just necessity of acting up to this sixth law of our rational nature, as explained above, we add the acquirements of the ninth, in order to promote and secure our highest and most permanent happiness by cultivating, in the best and highest manner all our powers and faculties, physical, intellectual, and moral, from infancy to maturity, and in calling them forth into action at the proper periods;—will we not especially cultivate and call into action, as fast, and as far as possible, these powers; the improvement and exercise of which contribute most to this high and benevolent design of our creation; namely, the knowledge and love of God; with all the blissful and glorious hopes and assurances of the gospel, both present and future, all of which are attainable by faith only? Will we not, therefore cultivate the faculty of believing, with which we are so liberally endowed from our very infancy, that our progressive happiness, our diversified gratification, may increase as fast as possible—may grow with our growth and strengthen with our strength. For who knows not that the chief of our gratifications consist in the exercise of our minds upon the most lovely and interesting objects? And what can equal for grandeur, for beauty, for variety, for interest, for permanency—the glorious, the wonderful, and lovely objects presented to our minds in the Holy Scriptures, to allure our souls to the love of piety and benevolence—of all manner of virtue and goodness? Or what so terrible or dissuasive as the exhibitions of the divine displeasure against every species of impiety, of iniquity, and cruelty to our fellow creatures? And are not these things addressed and adapted to our intellectual faculties? Have we not the faculty of believing upon testimony—of discerning its credibility—of loving and hating—of hoping and fearing—of admiring, desiring, rejoicing—of gratitude and resentment? And does not our intellectual happiness consist in a duly apportioned succession of those exercises toward their proper objects? Does not the eighth law of our nature demand *variety* in order to healthful enjoyment? And does not the law under consideration call for the cultivation of our

moral faculties? And are not the above objects adapted to the cultivation of these faculties?

But to proceed. We have farther proof of the designed or involuntary ambiguity of our opponent. He still persists in the use of the word *created*. What is the import of the word *created?* In reply to this question, Mr. Owen says that he does not know whether he ever was created. Therefore, for Mr. Owen to use the term *created* is an imposition upon our language and feelings. What is the import of the word *feeling?* What does Mr. Owen mean by applying the term *belief* to the strongest impressions made upon our *feelings?* If I put my finger into the fire I *feel* that I am burned; but according to Mr. Owen's use of terms, from this *feeling* results my *belief* that I am burned; and I ought, to speak in his style, to say that I *believe* I am burned, and that this belief is involuntary. We have protested already against this licentious use of terms. We have affirmed that the term *belief* cannot have reference to our sensations, but can only be applied legitimately to matters dependent upon testimony; that where there is no testimony there can be no belief. It is common, we admit, to say that we have the testimony of our own eyes, or ears, but this is language merely eulogistic of the utility and perfection of those organs; but in strict propriety of speech, we cannot use the term *belief* where there is neither *oral, written, or traditional testimony.* But, with Mr. Owen, the word *belief* is *nomen generalissimum*—a word of the greatest general and comprehensive signification—almost equivalent, in the latitude in which he uses it, to a universal language. If I *feel* hot or cold, or wet or dry, or sick or well, weary, or refreshed, according to Mr. Owen's latitudinous use of the word, I must say that I *believe* that I *feel* all these varied sensations.

He says that each individual is so created that he must believe according to the strongest impression made upon his eye, or ear, or nose, or heart, or any appetite, passion, or power which he possesses; or, in other words, fire will burn him, water will drown him, and the breeze will cool him whether he will it or not; and, therefore, this belief is involuntary. From such confusion of terms we may infer that there is a corresponding confusion of ideas; for confusion of terms is the offspring either of confusion of ideas, or a mistake of the meaning of terms. Whatever a person clearly conceives, he can clearly express. *Verba sequntum res;* or, in English—words follow ideas, is a true and instructive maxim. Whole systems of error, when analysed, have been found to proceed from a misapprehension and misapplication of terms. And, indeed, I am not without very considerable misgivings that this may be one radical cause of the illusion which has captivated my friend and opponent, Mr. Owen.

MR. OWEN'S TWENTY-FIRST ADDRESS.

My friends—In this discussion, I am to prove and establish certain points. Mr. Campbell, on the other hand, has undertaken to dis-

prove them. The course I have pursued plainly indicates how much I wish to reply to Mr. Campbell's observations, whenever he brings forward anything that to me appears rationally and legitimately entitled to a grave reply; but when Mr. Campbell endeavors to introduce into this debate theological speculations, which none but those trained in them can perceive belong to the subjects, I really cannot reconcile it to my notions of the propriety and decorum which the dignity of this debate requires to be mutually and reciprocally observed, to indulge myself in any reply to what I conceive to be so impertinently irrelevant to the real merits of the question; therefore, when I do not give Mr. Campbell a direct reply, you must do me the justice to believe, that I cannot recognize the matter propounded as applicable to the questions before us. I now perceive that Mr. Campbell's associations of ideas are indeed very different on these subjects to those combinations which have been formed in the most intelligent minds in the most advanced societies in Europe and America. He has been evidently always within religious circumstances, and his mind is overwhelmed with their influences. While I have fortunately escaped out of them, and freely examined and experienced the influences of almost all the other circumstances to be found in civilized society. Mr. Campbell, therefore, thinks that important to the discussion of the subjects before us, which I know, in the present comparatively advanced state of knowledge, not to be deserving of any record in our proceedings; and I therefore pass it over without further notice. Mr. Campbell has informed you that it was not in the nature of man to be compelled to support clerical institutions against their will, and to pay them money. In reply, I request him to ask the catholics of Ireland if their large sums which they annually contribute to support the established church of England, in Ireland, are not rendered solely against their will; and in England, large sums are extracted from the Jews and dissenters in support of their established religion, solely against their inclination.

But the most singular misconception of Mr. Campbell is in relation to the laws which govern our belief of facts. Now, there is nothing more familiar to the human mind, than that when we read history, and find the facts stated to be in the regular order of nature, to be well attested, and not contradicted by other equal authority, for us to believe such facts to be true. While, on the other hand, when we read of facts stated to exist, which are opposed to the well ascertained laws of our nature, and which require stronger evidence than any history can afford; we, as rational beings, are compelled to withhold our belief in such statements; and it does not depend upon our will; for we cannot do otherwise. In the reading of history, it does not depend upon me to believe or disbelieve the historic facts related; one set of facts I can believe without effort; while another appears so improbable, it becomes impossible to force myself to believe them.

I have been asked for my definition of the word fact. Now, using

the word in its common acceptation, it is considered to be a fact or no fact that man, at birth, is ignorant of his organization; and so on throughout the whole twelve facts which I have stated. These are either facts or no facts; and it is Mr. Campbell's business and duty to show to the contrary, if he does not believe them to be facts. But what perplexes Mr. Campbell is the exclusive attention he has paid to metaphysics. His attention has never been directed to the examination and ascertainment of facts. The difference between Mr. Campbell and myself, is this: I have for many years attended to nothing but facts; and Mr. Campbell to nothing but imagination. For instance, with regard to the fundamental law of our nature. It is either a fact or no fact that we have the power of believing or disbelieving at will. I have put the test to Mr. Campbell; and he has shown the fact to be so true that there is no opposing it. In like manner I would say, that it is a fact that man's will has or has not power over his belief; in like manner, it is a fact that we *know* those things of which we are informed by the evidence of our senses; and we are compelled to *believe* those things which are thus forced into our minds upon the merits of the testimony which verifies them. In like manner it is or is not a fact that all religions of the world have been founded in ignorance. My affirmative is, that all the religions of the world have been founded in ignorance. I offer proof and arguments in support of this proposition; and all Mr. Campbell might say for a thousand years would be but idle words unless he can disprove this fact. I tell you nothing but truths, my friends; and when you come to reflect coolly upon my statements, and to study facts for yourselves, you may depend upon it, that you will find these much more true than the gospel; and it is now these very errors that prevent the establishment of a society of charity, in its most extensive sense, over the world. Mr. Campbell and I take a great deal of pains not to be angry with each other; but were it not for the erroneous notions implanted by religion, we should have no angry feelings on account of difference of opinion, and our present discussion would only be a little pleasant excitement to us both.

But to be again serious upon these important subjects. The religions of the world are the only cause why we cannot establish a society that shall have sincerity for its foundation—for where religious notions prevail there can be no real sincerity. All religions presuppose that all men should think alike upon the fundamental principles of each peculiar religion; and therefore many professors of it are compelled by various considerations to conceal their real sentiments, and to live in a state of continual deception. At present there is scarcely anything to be found in society that merits the name of truth—scarcely upon any occasion are you told the truth, except, perhaps, when I come among you, and then I know how disagreeable it is to you. But I hope the time will come when we shall all have the happiness of speaking what we think and feel; and to do

this, and to experience all the beneficial results of a conduct so rational would be to produce heaven upon earth. We have discovered by experience, in some few instances, what fine feelings are produced by such conduct. If we only knew each other as we are known, as we should do by speaking only what we really thought and felt, we could not avoid acquiring great kindness toward each other. Wherever you find an open, honest character, without deceit, that character gets through the world without difficulty. It is a thorough knowledge of ourselves and of each other, that can alone lay the foundation of love and affection, in human society. Upon no other base can permanent and extensive kindness and sincerity be established; and that not in a little circle of a few hundred thousand, or a few millions, but among the whole family of man. It is, therefore, true, as I have stated, that religion is the only barrier in the way of forming a society of virtue, intelligence, and kindness, and charity, in its most extended sense, among the whole human family, for as soon as we can get rid of the errors of religion, there can be no obstacle in the way of our forming a society with these qualifications. Then we shall have no local or geographical prejudices—no district religions—but all will be so trained as to recognize no line of demarcation between man and his fellow; we shall all feel ourselves to be of one family, and act as if we really were so. But to form a society of virtue, intelligence, and charity, in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness, we must first know what manner of beings we are; and when we discover how we are organized, and how our character is subsequently produced, there can be no difficulty in establishing a society of this kind as soon as everything in religion that is opposed to the laws of our nature, shall be withdrawn from the world. We shall then know how to create circumstances, which cannot fail to communicate to each individual the most superior character of which his organization is susceptible. No religion has ever yet formed any uniformly good character for mankind; but understanding the laws of our nature, we learn to take a mathematical course, to form a character greatly superior to any that ever has existed.

We may think the invention of a ship, of a timepiece, of spinning machines, or the steam-engine, etc., of great importance; but what are these, compared with the science which shall teach us the right mode to form into excellence every child that shall come into existence. By this science, we shall be instructed how to train the physical, intellectual, and moral qualities of children, in the best manner, and thereby enable them to attain a high point of perfection—and yet their faculties will never be exercised beyond the point of temperance. The constitution of our nature is such, that *all* our faculties must be cultivated and exercised, or else we become but parts of human beings, and, therefore, but partially happy. Your existing modes of training cause you to be human beings but in part—

not one part in ten of your faculties have ever been developed, or called into action; but, understanding the laws of our nature, we shall know mathematically how to train every child that comes into existence.

I have not the least doubt but each of us might have been trained to be much superior to what we are. Individually, we are but mere pigmies, compared to the ancient Greeks and Romans, although as nations, the moderns are superior to them. These ancients cultivated many more of the faculties of each individual, than is the practice in modern times, and many of their powers were much better brought out. But neither these ancients, highly as their physical and intellectual powers have been cultivated, nor any of our immediate ancestors, will be at all comparable to men whose physical and intellectual faculties shall be understood, experienced, and developed as they ought to be. Our present views, my friends, are very cheering; we have the prospect of breaking the shell of ignorance and darkness, which has so long imprisoned our faculties—we are now like the chicken picking at the shell, in order to set itself at liberty and see the light. This will be a glorious era, and my friend, Mr. Campbell, will assist in hastening its arrival, for he has a strong yearning after an improved state of society which he calls the millennium. At present it cannot be expected that Mr. Campbell should think with me. He has a powerful mind, but has experienced the natural result of early prepossessions, and it has been hurt by too much learning—but when he comes to compare, to investigate, and to ascertain facts, I do expect that he will become a powerful apostle in the cause I advocate. I have told you that these same twelve old laws, which Mr. Campbell does not seem to like, will point out to us practical measures for the promoting and securing of our true interests and happiness. They develop to us distinctly the mode in which the worst characters have been formed; and also, how the medium character of man (now the only kind to be met with) has been produced. They further point out to us the manner in which all may be made to possess the most superior character. And I have very little doubt that it will be found quite easy in practice, to make every individual of the second generation greatly superior to the present; and beyond all comparison, superior to any human being whose character has been formed under the old systems of the world.

I have now gone through the four clauses of this part of the subject. I have given you my reasons for being compelled to believe that all religions have been founded in the ignorance of man, that they are opposed to the unchanging laws of our nature, and are the real source of vice, disunion, and misery of every description; and that they are now the only bar to the formation of a society over the earth, of virtue, intelligence and happiness.

We now come to the last clause of the subject, which is, that

these religions can no longer be maintained, except through the ignorance of the mass of the people, and the tyranny of the few over that mass.

Do you know, my friends, that the beginning of this week in this place was the first period in the history of man, when truths the most simple in their nature, and the most important to the happiness and well-being of man, could be publicly spoken. There never has been any antecedent time, in the history of any country, in which any individual has been permitted to speak as I have done.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWENTY-FIRST REPLY.

We would suppose, from the various oracular predictions which my friend delivers, that he was a prophet. He has been giving us prediction upon prediction; but unfortunately his prophetic reputa- is not uniformly sustained by the accomplishment of former predictions. The treachery of his former predictions forbids confidence in the present. We waited past the time for the fulfillment of his prophesy, three years ago uttered, that Cincinnati would become a deserted or evacuated city before two years; that the citizens would all migrate to New Harmony. But we still find a few people living here, and the sound of the workman's hammer is yet heard in the streets.

I concluded my last address by remarking that the document read to you, and presented to my friend, was drawn up with a view to elicit a discussion of Mr. Owen's favorite position. I have done everything in my power to bring him to an issue on this point, but with what success you all see. We have given you definitions of the terms *fact, faith, testimony*, etc.; but all that we can elicit from Mr. Owen is a reiteration of the assertion that everything which exists is a fact; that is, if his library contains ten thousand books, it consists of exactly ten thousand facts. Now this is a language as novel and strange as is the theory of Mr. Owen.

We have asserted that Judaism and Christianity were founded upon matters of fact—upon things *done* by the divine power; that these facts, in the first instance, were attested by the most competent and credible witnesses; that their testimony was delivered to the people orally, and that millions believed upon their oral testimony; that this testimony was afterward put into a written form, and that in this shape it has come down to us; and that upon this kind of testimony our faith in christianity chiefly rests. Now the question before us is, *Whether faith, thus built upon testimony, is, or is not, influenced by our volitions?* This is the naked, simple question, which we ought now to discuss. I therefore ask my friend, for the sake of coming to an issue, whether the term *belief* imports anything more than the cordial reception of testimony? Is this belief in any degree influenced by our volitions? Is not volition the consequent of the last dictate of the understanding? But were he to define the term *volition*, we would most probably discover that

our opponent differs from us in his acceptation of the term. But, suppose, for example, I have a friend and an enemy: I have conceived such a character of my enemy as to find it difficult to believe a good report of him. As to my friend, I am well disposed to believe all good of him. Suppose, then, that different persons should testify to me something in favor of my enemy and of my friend too: would the same amount of evidence in both cases produce in my mind the same degree of assurance in regard to the facts related? This illustration does not come altogether up to the point, but it comes near enough to elicit a fair investigation, if Mr. Owen would meet the question upon its merits. It is an old adage, that we too easily believe what we wish to be true; and what we do not wish to be true, with difficulty we believe.

Mr. Owen says he tells the truth: that is enough; you must believe him. But when did I say that persons could not be compelled to pay money against their will to support any religion? I perceive that if I continue in this way, merely excepting to my opponent's premises, he will continue repeating them, as if a *repetition* of his theory was sufficient to silence all objections, and carry conviction to every heart. These twelve facts, in this way, might be brought to prove or disprove anything. Mr. Owen is like certain witnesses which sometimes appear in our courts: when cross-questioned, they imagine it to be indispensably necessary to go over the whole story again; and if they are ten times cross-examined, they cannot be made to understand that it is *not necessary* to begin at the beginning and tell the whole story over again. But I will try, if it is possible, to get on with the argument in some other way. I had intended a full recapitulation of my argument from the beginning, but circumstances compel me to confine my recapitulation to my last argument, finished yesterday. The following were its outlines:

1. We attempted yesterday to develop still farther the criteria by which we distinguish the historic facts that are certainly true, from those that are false or doubtful.

2. We showed that the facts on which the Jewish religion is based have these criteria.

3. We next demonstrated that it would be impossible, according to our experience, to institute monuments, or commemorative institutions, of alleged facts which never happened.

4. We showed that circumcision, the Sabbath, the passover, the redemption of the first-born, the selection of the tribe of Levi, and all the Jewish festivals, were commemorative institutions to assure posterity of the indubitable certainty of the facts on which their religion was built.

5. We alleged that the types and symbols of the Jews' religion were most wisely designed to furnish the world with a supernatural vocabulary; and not merely to establish the past institutions, but to introduce the christian religion.

6. We then asserted that there was no contradictory testimony cotemporaneous with the Jewish institution.

7. We next produced corroborating documents from the remotest antiquities of the surrounding nations.

An ingenious opponent might have presented me with one or other of the only two conceivable objections to my reasoning. As Mr. Owen has not presented them, I will do it myself. Human ingenuity can devise but two objections to this argument. The one is, that these commemorative institutions were imposed upon the Jewish nation at a period long posterior to the times when the alleged facts were recorded to have transpired; that is to say, that some five hundred years after the happening of the events, it was required of the people to perform certain actions commemorative of them. Now the question is, is it within the compass of our experience to conceive of the possibility of any people being induced, at a prescribed time, to begin solemnly and scrupulously to observe all these religious customs, and conform to all these commemorative institutions, if the reasons assigned were not founded on demonstrated facts? The question is just this, Could we of the present day now be induced, by any sort of influence, from this time forth to celebrate the aniversary of an event said to have happened a hundred years ago, of which we have no satisfactory proof? The universal experience of mankind proves that we could not—it would be an imposition which it is not in human nature to submit to. The second objection which might be urged to these premises, is, that Moses found the Jews in the practice and observance of these institutions, and that from his own brain he manufactured the reasons for them; that he found, for example, the rite of circumcision and the institution of the Levitical priesthood held in great reverence by these people; and that he told them these were commemorative of certain matters of fact recorded in their history, written by himself, which they had never heard before; but that he now reveals to them the reason, and constrains them to say that these commemorative actions have respect to events of which they never before heard.—On this hypothesis the difficulty is this: that at this very time he suggested these things to the people, they must have inquired with deep interest whether these reasons assigned by Moses were the true ones; and moreover, this absurdity is implied in the objection that the people had been long in the practice of these observances without knowing any reason for them! Neither of these hypotheses are conceivable upon any known principle of human nature, and these are the only two objections which can be offered to the conclusion which I have deduced from these premises.

I know that the reason why my opponent objects to receiving the testimony of these holy men, is based upon a principle which he has not avowed. That principle we wish now to expose; and, therefore, before we enter on the historic argument, we must present you with a brief analysis of the reasonings and objections of David Hume.

David Hume affirms that "experience is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact," and that "our belief, or assurance of any fact from the report of eye-witnesses, is derived from no other principle than experience; that is, our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses."

To detect the sophistry of Hume, we must give a true definition of experience:—

Experience is either personal or derived.

"*Personal* experience is founded in MEMORY, and consists solely of the general maxims and conclusions that each individual has formed from the comparison of the particular facts he hath remembered."

"*Derived* experience is founded in *testimony*, and consists not only of all the experiences of others, which have, through that channel, been communicated to us; but of all the general maxims or conclusions we have formed, from the comparison of particular facts attested."

Our opponents, by the term *experience*, must mean *personal* experience, unless they make use of sophism called by logicians, "*a circle in causes;*" for *derived* experience is derived from testimony, and cannot be contrasted with it; for it is the same with the assurance attendant on, or is the result of, faith.

Now if all testimony is to be judged by our *personal* experience, or by our memory, or senses, we shall be reduced in the measure of our information even below the savage himself. It will be impossible for an inhabitant of the torrid zone to be assured that water can become solid as a rock; or for an Icelander to believe in the existence of an animal called a Negro. No number of witnesses, however *credible*, could establish such facts in the minds of those who have no recollection of seeing them.

The sophistry of the whole reasoning of Hume on this subject is involved in this one period:—

"TESTIMONY *is not entitled to the least degree of faith*, but as far as it is supported by such an *extensive experience*, as if we had not a previous and independent faith in *testimony we never could have acquired.*"

David Hume asserts—"A miracle, supported by any human testimony, is more properly a subject of derision than of argument;" p. 194. Again—"No testimony for ANY KIND OF MIRACLE can ever possibly amount to a probability, much less to a proof." Yet, page 203, he owns, "there may possibly be miracles or violations of the usual course of nature of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony; though, *perhaps*, it will be impossible to find any such in all the records of history." "Suppose," adds he, "all authors in all languages agree that from the 1st of January, 1700, there was a total darkness over the whole earth for eight days. Suppose that the tradition of this extraordinary event is still strong

and lively among the people, that all travelers who return from foreign countries bring us accounts of the same tradition, without the least variation of contradiction, it is evident that our present philosophers, instead of doubting of that fact, ought to receive it for certain, and ought to search for the causes whence it might be derived.

This same Mr. Hume asserts that "*testimony has no evidence but what it derives from experience:* these differ from each other only as a species from the genus."

"*The love of the marvelous,*" and "*religious affection,*" are assigned as the great causes of imposition in matters of testimony concerning *miracles* and *prodigies*. Mr. Hume and other skeptics have in their constitution a little of the love of the marvelous; but instead of the *religious affection*, they have a strong *religious antipathy*. Hence Mr. Hume says, "Should a miracle be ascribed to any new system of religion, this very circumstance would be a full proof of a cheat, and sufficient with all men of sense, not only to make them reject the fact, but even *reject it without farther examination.*"

"The *violations of truth* are more common," says the same author, "in the testimony concerning religious miracles." [*Gratuitous declaration!*] This "should make us form a *general resolution* never to lend attention to it, with whatever specious pretext it may be covered."

Mr. Hume and other Free Thinkers preach *implicit* faith, and warn their followers of the danger of consulting reason. "Beware," says Hume, "of inquiring into the strength of the plea; for those who will be so *silly* as to examine the affair by that medium, and seek particular flaws in the *testimony*, are almost sure to be confounded."

Miracles are not aided in gaining credit by the *religious affection;* for all the Bible miracles, at least those in support of christianity, are rather impaired by it. Miracles performed in proof of a religion *to be* established, and in *contradiction* to opinions generally received, and the evidence of miracles performed in support of a religion *already* established, and in *confirmation* of opinions generally received, are in the former case not aided by the religious affection; and in the latter case they are; but as is the advantage in the latter, so is the disadvantage in the former. Let this be weighed.

If Mr. Hume's dogmas can be believed, or if his positions on testimony, evidence, and experience are to be admitted, then it follows (for this is his system in one sentence) — "It is impossible for the Almighty to give a revelation attended with such evidence that it can be reasonably believed in after ages, or even in the same age, by any person who has not been an eye-witness of the miracles by which it is supported."

Dr. George Campbell, of Aberdeen, in his Essay upon Miracles, has made these and other positions of the celebrated Hume appear subjects of *derision* rather than of argument. I do not think there

is to be found in the English language a more complete and masterly refutation of any system of error, than is the Essay upon Miracles of the system of Hume. Hume felt himself defeated—completely defeated. He never replied to it. And I have it from living testimony, that when Hume's friends jested him upon the complete defeat of his system, he acknowledged that "the Scotch theologue had beaten him." But such was his pride of understanding, that he did not publicly acknowledge his defeat in any other way than by never presuming to answer the Essay. It is mortifying to hear the dogmas of Hume brought forward by his skeptical disciples, and attempted to be passed current as oracular precepts, when their master dared not to defend them himself. There is not, from so able a pen, a more vulnerable position than that which is the corner stone of the temple of skepticism. It is that on which Mr. Hume rears his fabric, viz: that every man's personal experience is to be the measure and standard of his faith. He that has never seen a whale cannot believe that there is one.

No man can have any *experience* of the future. *Query*—How do we learn that the *future* will resemble the past?

"Our belief of the *continuance* of the laws of nature cannot be founded either upon knowledge or probability," and is not derived from reason; and how comes it that Mr. Owen talks with so much certainty about what will come to pass hereafter! No man can speak of the future, pretending to any certain knowledge, but the christian. Here the infidel's candle goes out, and except he obtains some oil from the lamp of revelation, he must continue in perpetual darkness.

It was necessary, my friends, to introduce this brief analysis of the principal objections against the truth of the christian miracles. You will easily perceive, that sentiments contained in my extract from Mr. Hume, are the reasons of Mr. Owen. Mr. Owen will not believe a miracle, because it is contrary to his experience—and for precisely the same reason, no people who had not traveled, could be made to believe that there existed on the face of the earth any other nation or country than their own.

Lord Bacon himself lays the foundation for correcting our reasonings upon this, as well as upon other subjects. Some of his aphorisms are:

Man is ignorant of everything antecedent to observation.

There is not a single department of inquiry in which a man does not err, the moment he abandons observation.

The greater part of all human knowledge is derived from testimony, but testimony does no more than hand down to us the observations of others.

What is science but a record of observed phenomena grouped together according to certain points of resemblance, which have been suggested by an actual attention to the phenomena themselves!

In none of the inductive sciences can the student verify everything by

his own observation; he must rely upon testimony for the large majority of facts. This is especially true in the natural sciences of geography, geology, and chemistry.

These principles are not contrary to a single position we have taken in this discussion; indeed, our investigation has proceeded upon these as the basis of the laws of investigation.

The great question, as Chalmers, I think, or some other very argumentative writer, states; the great question, on which the whole argument rests, is this: *Shall we admit the testimony of the apostles, upon the application of principles founded upon observation, and as certain as is our experience of human affairs; or shall we reject that testimony upon the application of principles that are altogether beyond the range of observation, and as doubtful and imperfect in their nature as is our experience of the counsels of Heaven!*

The former is founded upon EXPERIENCE, the latter upon ASSUMPTION; and here I make my stand, and say, Attack it who may—that our faith in christianity is most certainly based upon *experience*—and infidelity upon *assumption*—upon ASSUMPTION throughout. If Mr. Owen call me not to account for this, I hope some person more philosophic than he, may yet do it. I will make the principles of the inductive philosophy, too, my rule and guide in this investigation.

Mr. Owen has frequently told us of our extreme ignorance—but how emphatically does experience contradict Mr. Owen—only look at the improvements which have taken place in the lapse of the last three hundred years—and who have been their authors—who have laid the foundations?

MR. OWEN'S TWENTY-SECOND ADDRESS.

My friends—Mr. Campbell tells you that I am a false prophet; that I prophesied some time ago, that in a few years Cincinnati would be depopulated. But you know, my friends, that years do not mean the same thing in the language of prophesy, that they do in common language.

Instead, however, of Cincinnati only being depopulated in a few years, the fact is, that all large cities will cease to be such. Their inhabitants will discover, that cities are combinations of circumstances extremely injurious to every individual, and therefore, they will be compelled, by a distinct knowledge of their own interest to remove out of large cities, and to form smaller associations, to enable each to enjoy all the advantage of a town and country residence. I have no doubt that we shall discover, that all large cities are highly unfavorable to the happiness of individuals; so much for the prophesy of small and large congregations of men into one society. Now, my friend supposes that there really exists a desire on my part, not to believe the truth; but I can assure him, that my doubts of the truth of christianity originated against my will. I was most anxious to swallow the camel. I exerted all the volition of which Mr. Camp-

bell speaks, in fighting against my disbelief. But the more I investigated, the more strongly was I compelled to believe that christianity and all other religions were founded in the grossest error. With all the energy of volition which I could summon to my aid, I found it impossible to believe that which was contrary to nature. I cannot believe that the power which fills immensity, which pervades all space, and occupies the universe, contracted itself into a little bush, in order to speak to a man. I am just as much able, by the exercise of my volition, to fly to the stars, as I am to believe this. Now, I am come to the last clause of this discussion, in which I state, "that the religions of the world can be no longer maintained except through the ignorance of the many, and the tyranny of the few over the many." Now, my friends, what do you think is the most powerful engine, that ever was contrived by human ingenuity, to impose the grossest ignorance upon mankind, and to keep them in that state? Why, it is that cunning contrivance which exists so generally, pervading every village and hamlet, of preaching Sunday by Sunday to the people, and most arbitrarily and irrationally withholding from them the right of reply. Train up any population in such a system, and there is no absurdity which they may not be made to believe implicitly; and by this training their reasoning faculties are sure to be destroyed. So long as society shall tolerate such an abuse as this, ignorance must continue to pervade the world. While a particular tribe of men shall be permitted, week after week, and year after year, to impress upon your minds their own peculiar notions, without any right of reply on your side, there is no belief, however monstrous, that may not be forced into your minds. Thus it is that these religions contain the seeds, and the germs of every evil that the human mind can conceive. And unless this tremendous engine can be altered, or destroyed, it must, my friends, continue as heretofore, to afflict our race with all kinds of suffering. So long as it is permitted to continue in operation, there is neither health nor hope for you; you must forever be kept in the lowest mental degradation; and so long as the governing powers, and that engine are united and co-operative, or the prejudices of the people shall support such a system, their prospects are gloomy indeed. This engine presses them down into the lowest depths of ignorance; they are solemnly assembled to receive any impression their instructors may choose to give them. I speak not this with any view to hurt the feelings of those individuals, whom circumstances and the customs of society have placed in the station of spiritual teachers. I know that some of the finest minds among them do not believe one word of what the circumstances in which they are placed, compel them to preach; for when their existence, and the support of their families, depend upon their perseverance in that course, they must go forward in preaching that which they disbelieve, or they must starve.

Therefore, before we can calculate upon any valuable improvement in society, we must secure to those, whom society has encouraged to

become preachers of error, the continuance of their former support, in order that no preacher shall be made liable to poverty, or be deprived of a comfortable subsistence, but be placed in an independent situation, to teach the truth; and this is the best practical mode, by which to effect the change without evil. I know, my friends, how strongly you must feel the first time you have your early prejudices thus opposed; but I do not come before you as a quack doctor, who promises to do much for you, in order to obtain your money; but I come to probe your wounds to the bottom, to ascertain the true cause of your diseases. And I only give you this temporary pain, in order that you may be placed in a condition to enjoy future permanent happiness. If the few can be convinced (as I trust they shortly will be), that the old systems of the world are entirely worn out; then I hope and believe, that they will, of their own accord, assent to the adoption of rational measures, gradually to make the beneficial change I propose. But this change should not be effected by harsh measures, which might inflict injury upon any one; I should regret exceedingly that any individual should be a sufferer by the introduction of the great improvements which I contemplate for the human race. The great object I have had in view, has been to prepare the means by which the mighty moral change may be developed and consummated without disturbance, without shock, without anger or strife of any kind. And I think I do see most distinctly, all the necessary steps which may be taken to secure the attainment of these highly beneficial objects. I am busily engaged in these measures at present. When I leave you, I shall go to use my utmost exertions, to lay the basis of a solid and permanent peace among nations, who are now doing all they can to injure each other, although they are nominally at peace. I have a great many arguments by which to prove, that it is now the true interest of all nations to adopt this course; and I do not know of anything now existing in the condition of civilized nations to prevent the introduction of a solid and permanent peace. The peace which now exists among them, in which the nations are undermining each other, whenever their interests come into collision, is a peace much more nominal than real; a mere trifle would break it, a whim or caprice upon the part of one or two individuals might easily set Europe in a flame, and thence carry war and devastation into the four quarters of the world, and for no good purpose produce endless suffering and misery to individuals. Nations, like individuals, are now injuring each other without any benefit to themselves.

Mr. Owen observes that Mr. Campbell may reply to him, and prosecute his arguments without half hourly interruption; that when Mr. Campbell gets through with his reply, he will be ready with his rejoinder.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWENTY-SECOND REPLY.

It now appears that we are, at length, in full possession of all the arguments and evidences Mr. Owen has to offer in support of his

positions. You will, no doubt, observe, that although his matter has been exhausted, and his comments finished, he did not once advert to the very important points submitted in my last speech ; and submitted with the intention of eliciting from him something like an issue. But this he appears now, as formerly, studiously to avoid. One allusion, in the form of an objection, was made to my last speech. This was an objection to the arguments and views offered on the nature of evidence.

He said "he could as soon fly to the stars as believe that God *contracted* himself into a little bush to speak to Moses." But who is it that believes this ? I do not. All that the intelligent have ever contended for is, that the omnipotent and omnipresent Creator of this vast universe, can assume any visible form in any particular place, and exhibit himself just where, and when, and how he pleases. Mr. Owen caricatures, rather than quotes, or directly alludes to the circumstances of this case. Why is it that he cannot meet us on such ground as reason presents, that he must present himself on such ground as no person of sentiment or sense ever pretended to stand upon ? But what I have particular reference to at this time, is the reason he assigns for his disbelief in miracles. His reason for disbelieving miracles is because he never witnessed one. It is contrary to his experience. But we have already shown, that for the same reason he rejects this species of evidence, or a miracle itself, he would be compelled to reject all testimony upon any matter of fact that had not come under his own personal observation. It would be as impossible for Mr. Owen to convince a native of the torrid zone, that water became, in these United States, as hard as a stone, or that hailstones sometimes fell from the clouds, as it would be for me to convince him that Jesus Christ fed five thousand persons on a few loaves and fishes, or cured the lame, the deaf, and the blind, by a single word or a touch. The reason which a native of that region would assign for his unbelief, is just the same which Mr. Owen assigns for his disbelief in the miracles of Moses and Christ. They are contrary to *his experience*. Mr. Owen, however, is not consistent with his own theory in any case whatever—he seems to believe just what he pleases. He believes that meteoric stones, or stones composed of terrene substances, weighing from ten to one hundred pounds, have fallen from the clouds in different parts of the earth. This is also contrary to, or beyond the bounds of his experience. In fine, Mr. Owen's faith, small as it is, would be very considerably reduced in quantity and strength, were he to act consistently with his own experience. But we have already sufficiently exposed his inconsistency in this particular.

As I have now got the arena to myself, I will now submit to your consideration the course which I intend to pursue in conducting this argument, to something like a natural, and as far as circumstances will permit, to a logical termination.

1. I shall call your attention to the historic evidence of the christian religion;

2. I shall next give a brief outline of the prophetic evidences, or rather the evidence arising from the prophesies, found in the inspired volume;

3. We shall then draw some arguments from the genius and tendency of the christian religion;

4. And in conclusion, pay some attention to "*the social system.*"

This method, adopted now at the impulse of the moment, as best adapted to this crisis and stage of the discussion, may not be the most unexceptionable; but the singularity of the crisis to which we are come, will, I hope, apologize for its defects. If anything should be omitted, because not coming within the logical purview of this division of the subject, we shall rather endure the charge of being immethodical, than to omit noticing it, whenever it presents itself to our view.

But as we are soon to adjourn, I will occupy a few minutes in finishing some remarks, which were cut short by the expiration of my last half hour. It was said, that we are indebted for all the great improvements in society to the philosophy of christians, and not to the philosophy of skeptics. A free, a just, and equitable government has always developed the powers of the human mind. Political or civil liberty is essential to the expansion and development of human intellect. All history is appealed to in proof of this. Just in proportion as civil liberty has been enjoyed, have mankind, in all ages, distinguished themselves by the vigor and expansion of their minds. Let any man contrast the ancient Greeks, who were free, with their cotemporaries, the Persians, who were under a despotic government, and he will see the influence of free institutions in the genius, eloquence, and daring enterprise of the former compared with the latter. Should he ascribe the superiority of their being of a different race, or to the influence of climate, let him turn his attention to the Lacedæmonians and their helots or slaves. When the Messenians were two centuries in slavery, one Lacedæmonian possessed the mental vigor and valor of half a score of them. But only draw the contrast which our country presents, and mark the difference between the citizen and the slave. The enjoyment of civil liberty is shown from reason and experience, from the faithful page of history, to give a new impetus to all the faculties of man. To this liberty, then, we are constrained to ascribe the great improvements in all the arts of civilized and social life. But to see the connection between this liberty and these free institutions, and christianity, we have only to ask, to whom are we most indebted for the improvements in government? The Reformation from Popery gave the first shock to the despotism of Europe. The labors of the Reformers, and the more recent labors of Milton, the poet, and Locke, the philosopher, have done more to create the free institutions of Europe and America, than the labors of all the skeptics, from Celsus to my friend, Mr. Owen.

We ascribe much, to the intelligence, virtue and patriotism, of our revolutionary heroes and statesmen. But there was one Christian philosopher to whom we are more indebted than to any one of them. Nay, perhaps, than to all of them. The cause of civil and religious liberty owes more to the labors of Mr. John Locke, than to all the skeptics in Christendom. His Essay on Toleration, first burst the chains that held England and Europe fast bound under a religious and civil despotism. He had the honor, as Lord Verulam had, of originating a new era. As Lord Verulam had the honor, by his *Novum Organum,* of originating a new era in physics, so Locke, the philosopher, laid the foundation of a new order of society by his *Essay on Toleration.* This essay gave the first impulse to the spirit of inquiry, and laid the foundation of our present liberties. This christian philosopher, drafted the first instrument called a constitution, imported into America. It was a form of government for the Carolinas. While we are grateful to all, who have labored in the cause of the emancipation of the human mind from the shackles of kingcraft and priestcraft; and while we are mindful of our more immediate benefactors, we are not to forget the praises due to those who have long since died, and whose victories were more efficient, and salutary in their consequences, though less boisterous, and less noisy, than those achieved by the sword or the cannon. Yet it should be known, and everywhere divulged, in all lands and among all people, that Europe and America are more indebted to the elaborate discussions and profound reasonings of our christian philosopher, for the quantum of civil and religious liberty now enjoyed, than to all the skeptics who have written from the days of Pyrrhus to my friend Robert Owen.

The principles of investigation on which the inductive philosophy of Lord Bacon is founded, and those adopted by the christian philosopher, Sir Isaac Newton, are those which should govern us on this occasion. "Everything," says this great teacher, "is to be submited to the most minute observation.—No conclusions are to be drawn from guesses or conjectures. We are to keep within the certain limits of experimental truth. We first ascertain the facts, then group them together, and after the classification and comparison of them, draw the conclusion. There are generic heads or chapters in every department of physical or moral science. We are never to shrink from the test of those principles." Any arguments, therefore, which we may offer, we wish to be examined by the improved principles of the inductive philosophy, by those very principles which right reason and sound experimental philosophy have sanctioned as their appropriate tests. But questions of *fact* are not to be tried by mathematical evidence. It has been well observed, that "the sciences are of a social disposition, and flourish best in the neighborhood of each other; nevertheless each of them claims to be governed by laws which are perfectly *sui generis;* and none of them can be constrained to agree to an intercommunity of jurisdiction

with the rest: it is held essential to the truth and dignity of each of them, that it is to be tried only by its own laws." When we enter into an examination of *the testimony* on which religion is founded, we have no other scientific rules to resort to, than those which regulate and govern us in ascertaining the weight of all historic evidence.

The first position, then, which we submit for examination, is one which properly belongs to the more general head of historic evidence. It is in the following words: *"the volume called the New Testament was written by the persons whose names it bears, and at the time in which it is said to have been written."* This is now *a historic fact* asserted. It is not proved as yet by us—but we will, anon proceed to the proof of it. This is to be examined in its own court; that is, as all matters or questions of fact are investigated—that we may, however, feel the need, and appreciate the importance, of proving this fact, we must premise a few things: The book called the New Testament now exists. It existed in the days of our fathers, of our grandfathers, of our great-grandfathers. It came into existence some way, by some means, at some particular time. Now we thank not Mr. Owen, nor any person else, for admitting all this. They cannot deny one of these assertions. But the question is, *How came it into existence?* Now let us see how rigid and severe we must be, and generally are, in examining or deciding this question.

When we open any ordinary volume, and look upon its title page, we there discover that it purports to be the production of A. B. or C., and this mere inscription of the author's name on the title page is, *in the absence of counter testimony*, universally admitted to be rational and conclusive evidence of authorship. There being no counter testimony, we conclude from the title page, that the book is the production of the author whose name it bears. If we have the general concurrence of our cotemporaries in the belief that such a book was written by such a person whose name it bears, we rationally rest satisfied on the question of its authorship.—But in the examination of the authorship of the New Testament, we feel it necessary to scrutinize more severely. But men approach the examination of this question, not as they approach the examination of any other. The believer and the unbeliever approach it under great disadvantages. Religious men are afraid to call its truth in question. This religious awe acts as a sort of illusion on their minds. The skeptics are prejudiced against it. This prejudice disqualifies them to judge fairly and impartially upon the merits of the evidence. The religious awe of the christian, and the prejudices of the skeptic are real obstacles in the way of both, in judging impartially of the weight of evidence in favor of this or any other position, at the bottom of the christian faith. Dr. Chalmers very convincingly illustrates this matter in secs. 16, 17 and 18, of the article written by him in the Encyclopædia on Christianity. We shall beg the liberty to read it:

"16. To form a fair estimate of the strength and decisiveness of

the christian argument, we should, if possible, divest ourselves of all reference to religion, and view the truth of the gospel history, purely as a question of erudition. If, at the outset of the investigation, we have a prejudice against the christian religion, the effect is obvious; and without any refinement of explanation, we see at once how such a prejudice must dispose us to annex suspicion and distrust to the testimony of the christian writers. But even when the prejudice is on the side of christianity, the effect is unfavorable on a mind that is at all scrupulous about the rectitude of its opinions. In these circumstances the mind gets suspicious of itself. It feels a predilection, and becomes apprehensive lest this predilection may have disposed it to cherish a particular conclusion, independently of the evidences by which it is supported. Were it a mere speculative question, in which the interests of man, and the attachments of his heart, had no share, he would feel greater confidence in the result of his investigation. But it is difficult to separate the moral impressions of piety, and it is no less difficult to calculate their precise influence on the exercises of the understanding. In the complex sentiment of attachment and conviction which he annexes to the christian religion, he finds it difficult to say how much is due to the tendencies of the heart, and how much is due to the pure and unmingled influence of argument. His very anxiety for the truth disposes him to narrate the circumstances which give a bias to his understanding, and through the whole process of the inquiry, he feels a suspicion and an embarrassment, which he would not have felt had it been a question of ordinary erudition.

"17. The same suspicion which he attaches to himself, he will be ready to attach to all whom he conceives to be in similar circumstances. Now every author who writes in defense of christianity is supposed to be a christian; and this, in spite of every argument to the contrary, has the actual effect of weakening the impression of his testimony. This suspicion affects, in a more remarkable degree, the testimony of the first writers on the side of christianity. In opposition to it you have, no doubt, to allege the circumstances under which the testimony was given; the tone of sincerity which runs through the performance of the author; the concurrence of other testimonies; the persecutions which he sustained in adhering to them, and which can be accounted for on no other principle, than the power of conscience and conviction; and the utter impossibility of imposing a false testimony on the world, had they even been disposed to do it. Still there is a lurking suspicion, which often survives all this strength of argument, and which it is difficult to get rid of, even after it has been demonstrated to be completely unreasonable. He is a christian. He is one of the party. Am I an infidel? I persist in distrusting the testimony. Am I a christian? I rejoice in the strength of it; but this very joy becomes matter of suspicion to a scrupulous inquirer. He feels something more than

the concurrence of his belief in the testimony of the writer. He catches the infection of his piety and his moral sentiments. In addition to the acquiescence of the understanding, there is a *con amore* feeling, both in himself and in his author, which he had rather been without, because he finds it difficult to compute the precise amount of its influence; and the consideration of this restrains him from that clear and decided conclusion which he would infallibly have landed in, had it been purely a secular investigation.

"18. There is something in the very sacredness of the subject, which intimidates the understanding, and restrains it from making the same firm and confident application of its faculties, which it would have felt itself perfectly warranted to do, had it been a question of ordinary history. Had the apostles been the disciples of some eminent philosopher, and the fathers of the church, their immediate successors in the office of presiding over the discipline and instruction of the numerous schools which they had established, this would have given a secular complexion to the argument, which we think would have been more satisfying to the mind, and have impressed upon it a closer and more familiar conviction of the history in question. We would have immediately brought it into comparison with the history of other philosophers, and could not have failed to recognize that, in minuteness of information, in weight and quantity of evidence, in the concurrence of numerous and independent testimonies, and in the total absence of every circumstance that should dispose us to annex suspicion to the account which lay before us, it far surpassed anything that had come down to us from antiquity. It so happens, however, that instead of being the history of a philosopher, it is the history of a prophet. The veneration we annex to the sacredness of such a character, mingles with our belief in the truth of his history. From a question of simple truth, it becomes a question in which the heart is interested; and the subject from that moment assumes a certain holiness and mystery, which vails the strength of the argument, and takes off from that familiar and intimate conviction, which we annex to the far less authenticated histories of profane authors."

It is hard for any man to inspect this oracle with that degree of impartiality and mental independence necessary to demonstrate, or discriminate, in its truth. Many have suspicions of its truth, which arise solely from the awful import and inexpressible grandeur of the subjects on which it treats. The hundredth part of the evidence would be sufficient to convince them of the real authorship of the "*Annals of Tacitus*," which they require to satisfy them of the authorship of these sacred books.

Making all due allowance for these odds and disadvantages against us, and acknowledging that we claim no exemption from the influence of these causes, we are disposed to approach this volume, as far as in us lies, without being influenced by that awe, or those prejudices, of which we have been speaking. Divesting

ourselves, therefore, of all partialities, *pro* or *con*, let us, my friends, approach this position.

I need scarcely inform this intelligent audience, that the volume called the New Testament is the production of eight different authors or writers—that it contains many different treatises in the form of Narratives and Epistles, written in different parts of the world, and at sundry intervals, and afterward collected into one volume. These *eight* writers are, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude. Four of them wrote Memoirs or Narratives of Jesus Christ; and four of them wrote letters to different congregations and individuals, in Asia and Europe.

Each of these pieces was deemed by the writer perfectly sufficient to accomplish the object which he designed by it. But when all is collected into one volume, corroborating and illustrating each other, how irresistible the evidence, and how brilliant the light, which they display! To him who contemplates the New Testament as the work of one individual, all written at one time, and published in one country; and to him who views it as the work of *eight* authors, written in different parts of the world, and at intervals in the extremes more than half a century apart, how different the amount of evidence, intrinsic and extrinsic, which it presents! The writers themselves, though all Jews, born in different provinces of the Roman empire, having each a provincial dialect, a peculiarity of style, and some of them of different ranks and avocations of life, give great variety to the style, and weight to the authority of this small volume. They are eight witnesses, who depose not only to the original facts on which Christianity is based, but to a thousand incidents which directly or indirectly bear upon the pretensions of the Founder of this religion: and from the variety of information, allusion, description, and reference to persons, places, and events, which they present to us, they subject themselves not only to cross-examination among themselves, but to be compared and tried by cotemporary historians, geographers, politicians, statesmen, and orators: in fact, they bring themselves in contact with all the public documents of the age in which they lived and wrote. But of this hereafter in detail.

But to approach the position to be proved still more closely. This volume purports to be the writings of these eight persons, and has been transmitted from generation to generation as such. We ascend the stream up to its fountain. We find it ascribed to them in the last century. Millions believed it. In the century preceding that, millions believed it: and so on, till we come up very nigh the times in which the works were written. What would, let me ask—what would be the quality and amount of evidence necessary to establish the fact of authorship of any other work of antiquity? We claim no favors. We ask for no peculiar process, no new or untried form of examination. We will constitute no new court of inquiry. We will submit the question of authorship to be tried by all the canons, or regulations, or rules, which the literary world, which the most

rigid critics, have instituted or appealed to, in settling any literary question of this sort. Let me, then, ask—in such a court, would the fact of these writings having been universally received by all the primitive christians, as the works of their reputed authors, be admitted as sufficient proof? Would the fact of these writings having been quoted as the genuine works of their reputed authors, by the earliest christian writers, by the cotemporaries and immediate successors of the original witnesses, be admitted as proof? Would the testimony of neutrals, would the testimony of apostates, would the testimony of the first opponents of the christian religion, be admitted as proof? Would the concurrent and combined testimony of all these be admitted, to prove the mere question of authorship? Most unquestionably these embrace all the proofs which human reason can require, and all which the archives of human learning can furnish, in proof of the authorship of any literary work in the world. Yes, manifold more than ever has been called for, and much more than can be adduced, to prove the authorship of any work of the same antiquity. The poems of Virgil and Horace, the annals of Tacitus, the orations of Cicero, the most popular works of antiquity, cannot afford half the proofs that they are the genuine works of the persons whose names they bear, as can be adduced to prove the authorship of the Memoirs of Jesus Christ, written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

Although we might not be able to summon into one and the same court all the friends and all the enemies of christianity, who wrote something upon the subject in the Apostolic and in the succeeding age, to attest that all the writings now ascribed to those eight authors were actually written by them; yet we do, in effect, the same, by hearing them in piecemeal or in detail. For example: it is, to quote the words of Dr. Chalmers, "the unexcepted testimony of all subsequent writers, that two of the Gospels and several of the Epistles were written by the immediate disciples of the Savior, and published in their lifetime." Even Celsus, an enemy of the christian faith, and the first Gentile writer who publicly opposes christianity, admits this, or *refers to the affairs of Jesus as written by his disciples.* From the extracts which he makes in his book, there can be no doubt but that he refers to one or other of the four Gospels. He wrote about one hundred years after the first publication of the Narrative. "He takes it up upon the strength of its general notoriety, and the whole history of that period furnishes nothing that can attach any doubt or suspicion to this circumstance. The distinct assertion of Celsus, being an enemy to christianity, that the pieces in question were written by the companions of Jesus, though even at the distance of a hundred years, is an argument in favor of their authenticity, which cannot be alleged for many of the most esteemed compositions of antiquity."

But, although we give the testimony of Celsus first, it is not because there is no more ancient witness, but because he is the first

philosophic adversary of the faith. There is a series of writers, in unbroken succession, from the days of the Apostles, all attesting the truth of the position before us. I have lying upon the table here before me, a volume of the writings of the primitive disciples of Christ, and first teachers of christianity, the cotemporaries, and successors of the Apostles. Here (lifting up the volume Mr. C. said) here is the testimony of Barnabas, of Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp—Barnabas the companion of Paul, Clement the bishop of the congregation in Rome, whom all antiquity agrees to be the person mentioned by Paul, Phil. iv, 3.—Hermas, whom Paul mentions in his Epistle to the Romans—Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who flourished there A. D. 75, who took the oversight of that congregation thirty-seven years after the ascension of Christ. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had seen, conversed with, and was familiar with some of the Apostles—all these directly quote the historical or the epistolary books of the New Testament—and refer to these writings as of general notoriety. To these, I need scarcely add the testimony of Papias, the hearer of John, of Irenæus, Justin and others, their cotemporaries. They either quote them by saying, *as it is written*, or by name. Let us have an example or two: Barnabas, in his epistle, says, "Let us therefore beware lest it come upon us *as it is written*. There are many called but few chosen." Now, this mode of quoting Matthew's testimony is more authoritative than the naming of him; for this appeal to his writings makes it evident that they were notorious, and of unexceptionable authority, even so early as the time of Barnabas. In the letter written by Clement from Rome to Corinth, in the name of the whole congregation in Rome, to the whole congregation in Corinth, say from five hundred christians in Rome to five hundred christians in Corinth, the sermon on the Mount is directly quoted, and other passages of the testimony of Matthew and Luke. But it would be tedious to be minute in furnishing examples of each sort of quotations here; more than forty clear allusions to the books of the New Testament are to be found in the single fragment of Polycarp, and there are more quotations in Tertullian of the second century, from the New Testament, than are to be found of the writings of Cicero, in all the writers of two or three centuries. Indeed, from the very time in which these writings first appeared, they were received according to their dates, and quoted and applied in the decision of all controversies, by all the commentators, as possessed of an authority, and to be heard with a reverence, paramount to all other. So scrupulous, too, were the ancient christians of the authority of these writings, that when collecting them into one volume (for many years they were written and read in detached pieces) they would not agree to bind in the same parchment with them, any other writing not from the same authors. Some of them even objected to adding the Epistle to the Hebrews, because it wanted Paul's name; and some demurred to the Revelation, written by John, and to the Epistle of James, to the 2d of

Peter, the 2d and 3d of John, and to that of Jude, because they had not reached some places as soon as the others. But after making themselves better acquainted with the claims of these writings, they were added with the consent of all the christians in the Eastern, as well as in the Western Roman empire.

There is not a writer on religion, which has come down to us from the second century (and of such writers the second century was not barren) who has not quoted these writings, less or more, as we do at the present day. But why occupy so much time in proving a matter which, we presume, neither Mr. Owen himself nor any skeptic of the present day, will deny? The laborious Lardner has given most copious proofs of the notoriety of these writings, and of the many quotations from them by the earliest christian writers; and it is well observed by Paley, that "beside our gospels and the acts of the Apostles, no christian history claiming to be written by an Apostle, or apostolical man, is quoted within three hundred years after the birth of Christ, by any writer now extant or known; or if quoted, is quoted with marks of censure and rejection." It is also well remarked by another writer, "that the agreement of christians respecting the scriptures, when all the other differences are considered, is the more remarkable that it took place without any public authority being interposed. The only interference on record is that of the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 363. This council only declared, and did not regulate the public judgment of only a few neighboring churches, the council only consisting of thirty or forty bishops of Lydia, and the adjoining country. The congregations of christians, all independent at first, received those writings universally, because of their irresistible claims upon their faith. But I doubt not that as skeptics have the most faith in one another, they will prefer the testimony of one Celsus, an infidel, to the testimony of six men who had seen, conversed with, and were familiar with the Apostles. These six are Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp and Papias. Let them, however, remember, that their own Celsus, who had much better opportunities of detecting any imposition or fraud than they, appeals to the affairs of Jesus, as written by his own companions, and quotes these histories as notorious documents in his time."

[*Half hour out.*]

The Honorable Chairman rose and stated, that in consequence of notice given by Mr. Owen, that he has offered all he has to say in the opening, we propose that Mr. Campbell will proceed until he finish his argument now begun; and that Mr. Owen may then reply, Mr. C. rejoin, and the discussion close.

Mr. *Campbell* resumes—Mr. Chairman: Before resuming my argument, I presume it will not be amiss to state some facts relative to this discussion. Anterior to Mr. Owen's last visit to Europe, I had the pleasure of an interview with him, at which time we made our arrangements for this controversy. From the fluency with which Mr. Owen spoke of his system, and of the present state of society,

and from his known labors and zeal in the cause of skepticism, I did expect to find in him a very formidable disputant, and concluded it would be necessary for me to provide a great variety of documents for this discussion. The positions which have been so often read, I expected Mr. Owen would logically defend, one by one. He affirmed, and I denied. The *onus probandi* he took upon himself. Conscious of his inability to support these positions, it seems he has now abandoned them, any farther than assertions without proof, and declamation without argument, upon twelve other positions, may be imagined to have some bearing upon them. I was prepared to rebut his proofs and arguments, had he presumed to defend his affirmations, but did not expect to have to assume propositions affirmative of the authenticity of christianity, and prove them while I must rebut him. This failure of my friend, has very much embarrassed this discussion, and has obliged me to change my course, and to new modify my defense of christianity. Mr. Owen had not finished his prefatory address, until I saw that he could not argue the verity of his assertions. I was, however, so much circumscribed by the rules of logic and decorum, as not to feel myself authorized to pay no attention to his propositions and heterogeneous matter, but to go on and argue positions of my own. I have stood in the center of a circle of embarrassments—embarrassed by the obliquity of Mr. Owen's method, and his disregard to the decisions of the presiding Moderators—at one time reminded that the ladies do not hear me; at another, the stenographer groans under the rapidity of my pronunciation; anon, the apprehensions that my half hour is almost fled, restrain my tongue and embargo my thoughts; so that I am surrounded with very vicious circumstances, as Mr. Owen would say. But now I hope to be in some measure relieved from the influence of these embarrassing circumstances—although the singularity of the issue may oblige me to omit a very large proportion of the documents which I had expected to offer.

Authorized as I now am, by the decision of the bench, I proceed to the further confirmation of the truth of the position under discussion at the time of our adjournment.

That the historical and epistolary books of the New Testament, were written by the persons and at the times alleged by themselves, is, perhaps, in the estimation of some, already sufficiently established. It would be easy to swell the list of the original vouchers with many distinguished names of the primitive defenders of christianity, against the cavils and objections of Jews and Pagans. But the real strength of the evidence in favor of the authorship is in the cotemporary writers. When we descend the pages of history no farther down than the times of Origen, who succeeded Tertullian only about twenty-five years, we find such declarations as the following: "The four gospels (says he, and he arranges them as we have them now arranged) alone, are received without dispute by the whole church of God under heaven." That is, christians differed on other matters,

and in this one point *alone* there was not a single dissentient. It would only savor of display to add the names of Justin Martyr, Dionysius, Tatian, Hegesippus, Athenagoras, Miltiades, and a hundred others, who quote these writings as the works of the persons whose names they now bear. It was well said by Origen, in his dispute with Celsus, the Epicurean philosopher, and opposer of the faith, when quoting a passage from these inspired books: "Thus it is written, not in any private book, or such as are read by a few persons only, but in books read by everybody." We cannot proceed to another item intimately connected with this, without reading from the argumentative Chalmers, the following remarks on these sentiments:

"In estimating the value of any testimony, there are two distinct subjects of consideration; the person who gives the testimony, and the people to whom the testimony is addressed. It is quite needless to enlarge on the resources which, in the present instance, we derive from both these considerations, and how much each of them contributes to the triumph and solidity of the christian argument. In as far as the people who give the testimony are concerned, how could they be mistaken in their account of the books of the New Testament, when some of them lived in the same age with the original writers, and were their intimate acquaintances, and when all of them had the benefit of an uncontrolled series of evidence, reaching down from the date of the earliest publications, to their own times. Or, how can we suspect that they falsified, when there runs through their writings the same tone of plainness and sincerity, which is allowed to stamp the character of authenticity on other productions; and, above all, when upon the strength of heathen testimony, we conclude, that many of them, by their sufferings and death, gave the highest evidence that man can give, of his speaking under the influence of a real and honest conviction? In as far as the people who received the testimony are concerned, to what other circumstances can we ascribe their concurrence, but to the truth of that testimony? In what way was it possible to deceive them upon a point of general notoriety? The books of the New Testament are referred to by the ancient fathers, as writings generally known and respected by the christians of that period. If they were obscure writings, or had no existence at the time, how can we account for the credit and authority of those fathers who appealed to them, and had the effrontery to insult their fellow christians by a falsehood so palpable, and so easily detected? Allow them to be capable of this treachery, we have still to explain, how the people came to be the dupes of so glaring an imposition; how they could be permitted to give up everything for a religion, whose teachers were so unprincipled as to deceive them, and so unwise as to commit themselves upon ground where it was impossible to elude discovery. Could Clement have dared to refer the people of Corinth to an epistle said to be received by themselves, and which had no existence? or, could he have referred the christians at large to writings which they never heard of? And it

was not enough to maintain the semblance of truth with the people of their own party. Where were the Jews all the time? and how was it possible to escape the correction of these keen and vigilant observers? We mistake the matter much, if we think, that christianity at that time was making its insidious way in silence and in secrecy, through a listless and unconcerned public. All history gives an opposite representation. The passions and curiosity of men were quite upon the alert. The popular enthusiasm had been excited on both sides of the question. It had drawn the attention of the established authorities in different provinces of the empire, and the merits of the christian cause had become a matter of frequent and moral discussion in courts of judicature. If, in these circumstances, the christian writers had the hardihood to venture upon a falsehood, it would have been upon safer ground than what they naturally adopted. They never would have hazarded to assert what was so open to contradiction, as the existence of books held in reverence among all the churches, and which yet nobody, either in or out of these churches, ever heard of. They would never have been so unwise as to commit in this way a cause, which had not a single circumstance to recommend it but its truth and its evidences.

"The falsehood of the christian testimony on this point, carries along with it a concurrence of circumstances, each of which is the strangest and most unprecedented that ever was heard of. First, That men, who sustained in their writings all the characters of sincerity, and many of whom submitted to martyrdom, as the highest pledge of sincerity which can possibly be given, should have been capable of falsehood at all. Second, That this tendency to falsehood should have been exercised so unwisely, as to appear in an assertion perfectly open to detection, and which could be so readily converted to the discredit of that religion, which it was the favorite ambition of their lives to promote and establish in the world. Third, That this testimony could have gained the concurrence of the people to whom it was addressed, and that with their eyes perfectly open to its falsehood, they should be ready to make the sacrifice of life and of fortune in supporting it. Fourth, That this testimony should never have been contradicted by the Jews, and that they should have neglected so effectual an opportunity of disgracing a religion, the progress of which they contemplated with so much jealousy and alarm. Add to this, that it is not the testimony of one writer, which we are making to pass through the ordeal of so many difficulties. It is the testimony of many writers, who lived at different times, and in different countries, and who add the very singular circumstances, equally unaccountable, which we have just now enumerated. The falsehood of their united testimony is not to be conceived. It is a supposition which we are warranted to condemn, upon the strength of any one of the above improbabilities taken separately. But the fair way of estimating their effect upon the argument, is to take them jointly, and, in the language of the doc-

trine of chances, to take the product of all the improbabilities into one another. The argument which this product furnishes for the truth of the christian testimony, has, in strength and conclusiveness, no parallel in the whole compass of ancient literature."

To this we shall only add, that "the force of the above testimony is greatly strengthened by the consideration that it is the concurring evidence of separate, independent and well informed writers, who lived in countries remote from one another. Clement lived at Rome; Ignatius, at Antioch; Polycarp, in Smyrna; Justin Martyr, in Syria; Irenæus, in France; Tertullian, at Carthage; Origen, in Egypt; Eusebius, in Cæsarea, and Victorin, in Germany. The dangers which they incurred, and the hardships and persecutions which they suffered, some of them even unto death, on account of their adherence to the christian faith, give irresistible weight to their testimony."

That the scriptures of the New Testament are now read in language communicating substantially all the same ideas, originally expressed in them, appears from the quotations found in the works of these first advocates of the christian cause. To prevent the alteration or interpolation of these documents, the various sects which soon sprung up, afforded every sort of safeguard. Various sectaries arose under the influence of the Oriental philosophy, who rather engrafted christianity upon their philosophy, than embraced christianity as an entirely new system. The Platonic philosophy became the parent of many sects. The Platonists began to expound the scriptures philosophically, and this led to many factions among the christians. Each party soon got into the practice of quoting the scriptures to prove its own tenets. The opposing party narrowly scrutinized these quotations. This prevented the corruption of the text. And thus, by that government, which from evil still educes good, the very heresies themselves which disturbed the peace and retarded the progress of christianity, became the guardians of the integrity and purity of the text.

But I have not, as yet, to my own satisfaction at least, sufficiently fixed upon your memory, what I have more than once asserted, viz: That the testimony which the apostles and first christians gave to the facts composing the gospel narrative, was not opposed by any counter testimony. Neither the authorship of the Apostolic writings, nor the facts attested in them, were ever opposed by any contradictory statements. *All antiquity does not afford a vestige, public or private, of any contradictory testimony.* The appearance and life of Jesus Christ, the miracles which he performed, the lives, and labors, and mighty deeds of his Apostles, his death and its accompaniments, *are matters of fact uncontradicted in the annals of Rome, and of the world.* Nay, they are universally admitted, both by Jews and Pagans. Though the opposition was a most violent one, though ridicule, defamation and persecution, were all employed and displayed against the christian cause, *no one presumed to deny the facts.* "What but *truth* almighty could have stood such an ordeal, or com-

manded such an acquiescence? Edicts were promulgated against the christians, and philosophers employed to write against them, but the former never questioned the facts, and the latter quoted the gospel history as authentic, and attempted to explain it away.

Now the facts, many of them at least, were most easily disproved.—Such as Herod's summoning the scribes and chief priests on the application of the Magi; the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem; that John the Baptist proclaimed Jesus, and was beheaded by the intrigues of Herodias; that Jesus fed many thousands on a few loaves and fishes; that Lazarus was raised from the grave; that Jesus was crucified; that the Apostles were gifted with foreign tongues on Pentecost; that Peter and John, by the name of Jesus, cured a cripple of the greatest notoriety, at the beautiful gate of the temple; that Paul was detained a prisoner by Felix; the conduct of the magistrates at Philippi; his appearance before Agrippa, and Gallio, the elder brother of the philosopher Seneca; and a thousand others recorded, the most easy of detection and refutation, yet not one of all these contradicted by any writer of that age, Jew, Pagan, or apostate christian!

But so far from being contradicted by any of the cotemporaries, all the impartial facts are admitted by the adversaries themselves. We shall examine a few of the first adversaries of the christian religion. We shall begin with the celebrated Trypho. This violent opposer of the christian religion, was born before John the Apostle died. This is quite probable, for he held a public debate or dialogue with Justin Martyr, A. D. 140, in the city of Ephesus. During the debate, Justin Martyr mentions many of the gospel facts, and appeals to the miracles. Trypho and his four companions *admit* the facts, but ridicule the idea of Jesus being born of a virgin, as absurd; and say "it is foolish to suppose that Christ is God, and became man." He says it is impossible to prove that any can be God but the maker of the world. He denies not the facts, which, as a *Jew*, he had every facility to have done, had they been controvertible.

Justin cited the prophesy of Daniel, vii, 13, and argues from it. "But," replies Trypho, "these prophesies constrain us to expect the Messiah to be *great* and *illustrious;* but he who is called your Christ, is without reputation and glory, so that he fell under the greatest curse of the law of God: *for he was crucified.*"

Trypho tells Justin that "in the tables of the Greeks, it is said, that Perseus was born of Danae, while a virgin, he who is by them called Jupiter, having fallen upon her in the form of gold. Now, says he, you who affirm the same thing ought to be ashamed, and should rather say that this Jesus was man of man."

Again, Justin affirms that the Jews knew that Jesus rose from the dead. He adds: "The other nations have not proceeded so far in wickedness against Christ as you, who are even to them the authors of evil suspicions against that holy person, and against us, his disci-

ples; for after you had crucified that only blameless and just person, by whose stripes healing has come to all who approach the Father through him, *when you knew that he was risen from the dead and ascended into Heaven*, as the prophets foretold should happen, you not only did not repent of the evil things you had committed, but choosing chief men at Jerusalem, you sent them forth into all the earth to publish that the sect of the christians were Atheists."

Justin having shown, from the Jewish scriptures, that another beside the Father is called God, Trypho replied: "You have, my friend, strongly and by many passages demonstrated this. It remains that you show that this person, according to the will of the Father, *submitted to become man of a virgin, to be crucified, to die, to arise afterward, and to return to Heaven.*" Does not this prove that these facts, though ridiculed and defamed, could not be contradicted?

Lucian, the Syrian, who was born about the year 120, gives the following account of one Peregrinus, who publicly burnt himself in Greece soon after the Olympic games, about the year 165:

"Lucian was a native of Samosata in Syria: he was born some time in the reign of Adrian, which began in the year 117, and terminated in 138. Although he did not write expressly in opposition to christianity, he was strongly prejudiced against it. He gives the following account of Peregrinus, who publicly burnt himself in Greece soon after the Olympic games, about the year 165: 'Peregrinus, or Proteus, appears for a while to have imposed on the christians, and to have joined himself to them. Lucian, after saying that 'Peregrinus learned the wonderful doctrine of the christians by conversing with the priests and scribes near Palestine,' and after going on to observe that they 'still worship that great man who was crucified in Palestine, because he introduced into the world this new religion,' he adds: 'For this reason Proteus was taken up and put in prison, which same thing was no small service to him afterward, for giving reputation to his impostures, and gratifying his vanity. The christians were much grieved for his imprisonment, and tried all ways to procure his liberty. Not being able to effect that, they did him all sorts of kind offices, and that not in a careless manner, but with the greatest assiduity; for even betimes in the morning there would be at the prison old women, some widows, and also little orphan children; and some of the chief of their men, by corrupting the keepers, would get into prison, and stay the whole night there with him: there they had a good supper together, and their sacred discourses. And this excellent Peregrinus (for so he was still called) was thought by them to be an extraordinary person, no less than another Socrates. Even from the cities of Asia some christians came to him, by order of the body, to relieve, encourage, and comfort him. For it is incredible what expedition they use, when any of their friends are known to be in trouble. In a word, they spare nothing upon such an occasion; and Peregrinus's chain brought him

a good sum of money from them. For these miserable men have no doubt but they shall be immortal, and live forever; therefore they contemn death, and many surrender themselves to sufferings. Moreover, their first lawgiver has taught them, that they are all brethren when once they have turned, and renounced the gods of the Greeks, and worship that Master of theirs who was crucified, and engage to live according to his laws. They have also a sovereign contempt for all the things of this world, and look upon them as common, and trust one another with them without any particular security; for which reason any subtile fellow, by good management, may impose upon this simple people, and grow rich among them.' Lucian afterward informs us that Peregrinus was set at liberty by the governor of Syria, and that at length he parted from the christians.

"We have here an authentic testimony, from a heathen writer, who was well acquainted with mankind, to some of the main facts and principles of christianity. That the founder of the christian religion was crucified in Palestine; that he was the great Master of the christians, and the first author of the principles received by them; that these men called christians had peculiarly strong hopes of immortal life, and a great contempt for this world and its enjoyments; that they courageously endured many afflictions upon account of their principles, and sometimes surrendered themselves to sufferings. Honesty and probity prevailed so much among them, that they trusted each other without security. Their Master had earnestly recommended to all his followers mutual love, by which also they were much distinguished; and their assiduity in relieving and comforting one another, when under affliction, was known to all men. It is no disparagement to them that they were imposed upon by Peregrinus, who was admired by many others."

"Celsus, cotemporary with Lucian, was an Epicurean philosopher, who lived in the region of Adrian. He was one of the most virulent adversaries the christian religion ever had, and also a man of considerable parts and learning. The book which he wrote against the christians, in the year 176, was entitled "The True Word." He there introduces a Jew declaiming against Jesus Christ, and against such Jews as were converted to christianity. Origen's answer to Celsus is not a general reply, but a minute examination of all his objections, even those which appeared the most frivolous. He states the objections of Celsus in his own words; and, that nothing might escape him, he takes them, he says, in the order in which Celsus placed them.

"Celsus used only the gospels themselves in search of evidence against their truth. He never refers to any suspicious gospel or to any other accounts of the life of Christ. His attack is conducted *not by denying the facts* contained in the scriptures, of which he all along *admits* the truth, but by reasoning from such as the following topics: That it was absurd to esteem and worship one as God who

was acknowledged to have been a man, and to have suffered death: that Christ invited sinners to enter into the kingdom of God: that it was inconsistent with his supposed dignity to come to save such low and despicable creatures as the Jews and christians: that he spake dishonorably and impiously of God: that the doctrines and precepts of religion are better taught by the Greek philosophers than in the gospels; and without the threatenings of God." The following are specimens of the objections he brings forward.

"What need was there for carrying thee, while an infant, into Egypt, that thou mightest not be slain? For it did not become God to be afraid of death." "How can we think him God, who, to omit other things, performed none of those matters which we are told he promised? and who, being condemned by us, when he was sought to be punished, was caught basely lurking and flying, being betrayed by those whom he called his disciples?" "If you tell them that it is not the Son of God, but he who is Father of all whom men ought to worship, they will not be satisfied unless you also worship him who is the author of their seduction; not that they exceed in the worship of God, but that they, above measure, worship this man." Speaking of the crucifixion, Celsus says, "If not before, why did he not now, at least, exert his divinity, and deliver himself from this ignominy, and treat those as they deserved who behaved ignominiously both toward himself and his Father?" "If these men worshiped no other but the one God they might justly inveigh against all other gods. But now they out of measure worship one who but lately appeared, and yet imagine they do not sin against God, though they also serve his minister." He affirms that Jesus, being "brought up obscurely, and obliged to serve for hire in Egypt, learned there certain powerful arts, for which the Egyptians are renowned; then returned greatly elated with his power, on account of which he declared himself a God."

"Celsus represents Jesus to have lived but a few years before. He mentions its being said that Jesus was born of a virgin; that angels appeared to Joseph. He speaks of the star that appeared at the birth of Jesus; the wise men that came to worship him, when an infant, and Herod's massacring the children; Joseph's fleeing with the child into Egypt, by the admonition of an angel; the Holy Ghost descending on Jesus like a dove, when he was baptized by John, and the voice from Heaven declaring him to be the Son of God; his going about with his disciples, whom he calls boatmen, publicans, and wicked sailors; his healing the sick and lame, and raising the dead; his foretelling his own sufferings and resurrection; his being betrayed, forsaken by his own disciples; his sufferings; his praying, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" the ignominious treatment he met with; the robe that was put upon him; the crown of thorns; the reed put into his hand; his drinking vinegar and gall; and his being scourged and crucified; his being seen after his resurrection, by a fanatical woman (as he calls her,

meaning Mary Magdalene,) and by his own companions and disciples; his showing them his hands that were pierced, the marks of his punishment. He also mentions the angels being seen at his sepulcher, and that some said it was one angel, others that it was two; by which he hints at the seeming variation in the accounts given of it by the Evangelists. Upon the whole, there are in Celsus about eighty quotations from the books of the New Testament, or references to them, of which Origen has taken notice. And while he argues from them, sometimes in a very perverse manner, he still takes it for granted, as the *foundation* of his argument, that whatever absurdities could be fastened upon any words or actions of Christ, recorded in the gospels, it would be a valid objection against christianity.

"The reasoning, then, on both sides of this dispute proceeded on the supposition of the truth of the Gospel history. Celsus also grants that Christ wrought miracles. The difference between him and Origen, on this subject, lies in the manner of accounting for them; the one ascribing them to magic, the other to the power of God."

"Porphyry the philosopher, was born at Tyre, in Phenicia, about the year 233. He wrote a large treatise against the christian religion, of which he was a very able and learned opponent. He endeavors to overthrow the authority of the scriptures, not by denying their authenticity, but by endeavoring to point out in them contradictions and absurdities; but he opposes no contradicting statement. He does not deny the miracles, but calls them 'the works of cunning demons,' and refers to some who he asserts performed miracles as great. He appears to have been well acquainted with the scriptures, and refers to numerous passages and circumstances in them, which he perverts, after the manner of Celsus, pointing out what he deems immoral and absurd. 'If Christ,' he objects, 'be the way of salvation, the truth and the life, and they only who believe in him can be saved, what became of the men who lived before his coming?' 'Christ threatens everlasting punishment to those who do not believe him, and yet in another place he says, with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again, which is absurd and contradictory; for all measure must be limited to time.' He objects that Peter was reproved by Paul, for that he did not proceed uprightly in preaching the gospel. Hence he argues the falsehood of the whole doctrine, as if it were a mere invention, since the heads of the churches disagreed. Other passages of scripture he reasons upon in a similar manner. The cause why Æsculapius wrought no cures, as he says, in his time, and why the other gods no longer gave responses, neither intermeddled in the affairs of men, he ascribes wholly to the honor that was given to Jesus; 'Since Jesus has been honored, none have received any public benefit from the gods.'

"Notwithstanding what he says against the christians, Porphyry gives an honorable testimony to the character of Jesus Christ. In

his treatise, entitled, 'Philosophy of Oracles,' the following passage, preserved by Eusebius, occurs:

"What we are going to say, may perhaps appear to some a paradox, for the gods declared Christ to be a person most pious, and become immortal. Moreover, they speak of him honorably." And going on, he adds; "being asked concerning Christ, whether he is God, he (Apollo) answered, 'That he who is renowned for wisdom, knows that the immortal soul continues after the body; but the pious soul of that man is most excelling.' He therefore affirmed him to be a most pious person, and that his soul, which the foolish christians worship, like that of other good men, was after death made immortal; but being asked why he was punished? he answered, 'That the body indeed is ever liable to little torments; but the soul of the pious rests in the plain of Heaven.' And, immediately after this oracle, he adds, 'He was, therefore, a pious person, and went to Heaven, as pious persons do, for which cause you ought not to speak evil of him, but to pity the folly of the men," (namely who worship him).

"Hierocles the philosopher, was prefect at Alexandria, in the year 303. He composed two books in order to confute the christian religion. To these books Eusebius published an answer, which still remains. Hierocles endeavors to prove the falsehood of the scriptures, by attempting to show that they contradict themselves, for which purpose he makes observations on a great number of particular passages. The proof of christianity, from the miracles of Jesus, he tries to invalidate, not by denying the facts themselves, but by showing that one Apollonius had performed equal, if not greater miracles, which were recorded, he says, not by ignorant men like Peter and Paul, but by Maximus of Ægis, and Damis a philosopher. 'Now,' says he, 'we reckon him who did such wonderful things, not a god, but only a man, whereas they (the christians) give the appellation of God to Jesus, because he performed a few miracles.' Lactantius, in remarking on this, affirms, that the difference between the miracles performed by Jesus, and all impostors whatever, is evident from the manner in which they were regarded by mankind."

"Julian, the Roman Emperor, succeeded to the throne of the Cæsars in the year 361. He had once made a profession of christianity, but afterward abandoned it. In the year 363, he wrote a treatise in three books against the christians, and to confute the christian religion, against which he shows great inveteracy. Libanius the Sophist, who was acquainted with Julian, says: 'He wrote a treatise to show that these books which make the Man of Palestine to be God, contained nothing but silly and ridiculous matters.' Cyril wrote an answer to this work, in which he transcribes many passages from it at length. Julian, like others whose works we have been considering, *acknowledged the principal facts* of the gospel history. The nature of Julian's objections, as well as his admission of the facts related, will be seen from the following extracts: 'Jesus having persuaded a few among you, and those of the worst of men, has now

been celebrated about three hundred years, having done nothing in his lifetime worthy of remembrance, unless any one thinks it a mighty matter to heal lame and blind people, and exorcise demoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany.'—'Jesus whom you preach, was one of Cæsar's subjects. If you refuse this, I will prove it by-and-by. But the thing is acknowledged. For you say, that he, with his father and mother, was enrolled under Cerenius. Now, after he was born, what good did he do to his relations? For he says they would not obey him.'

"Alluding to the superstitious contentions of the christians of that time about the observance of Easter, he says: 'These things flow entirely from yourselves, for nowhere has Jesus or Paul delivered you these things, commanding you to do them. The reason is, they did not expect that ever you would attain to this degree of power; for they were content if they deceived servant-maids and slaves, and by their means some wives and husbands, such as Cornelius and Sergius; of whom, if the one is remembered among the noted men of that time, for these things happened in the reign of Tiberius or Claudius, do you think that I lie concerning the rest?'

"You are so unfortunate that you do not continue in those things which were delivered to you by the Apostles. For their successors have dressed them up for the worse, and more impiously. For neither Paul, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark, ventured to call Jesus, God. But that good man John, perceiving that numbers of the Grecian and Italian cities were caught with that distemper, and hearing, as I suppose, that the sepulchers of Peter and Paul were privately worshiped, was the first who had the boldness to pronounce it." Further, he objects what John says. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is the bosom of the Father? he hath revealed him. Whether then is this God word made flesh, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father? and if he is the same, as I think, then certainly even you have seen God; for he dwelt among you, and ye beheld his glory."

"Speaking of the christians, he scoffingly says: 'Not only they of his time, but that some of those who at the beginning received the word from Paul, were such, is apparent from what Paul himself says, writing to them. For I presume he was not so void of shame, as to send them such reproaches in his letter to them, if he had not known them to be just. These are the things which he writes of his disciples, and to themselves. 'Be not deceived, neither idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And you are not ignorant, brethren, that such were you also. But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified in the name of Jesus Christ,' 1 Cor. vi, 9—11. You see they were such, but they had been sanctified and washed, having been cleansed and scoured with water, which penetrates even to the soul. And baptism, which cannot heal the leprosy, nor the

gout, nor the dysentery, nor any other distemper of the body, takes away adulteries, extortioners, and all other sins of the soul.' In the above passage, Julian says, 'I presume he was not so void of shame as to send them such reproaches in his letter to them, if he had not known them to be just.' This is the very argument formerly insisted on respecting the testimony of the first christians, to whom the Epistles were addressed, which must have been applicable to them, or they would never have been received and acknowledged by them.

"In a letter to Arsacius, high priest of Galatia, referring to the impiety of the Heathens, Julian recommends the example of the christians: 'Why do we not look to that which has been the principal cause of the augmentation of impiety, humanity to strangers, care in burying the dead, and that sanctity of life of which they make such a show? all which things I will have to be really practiced by our people. It is not sufficient that you are unblamable yourself, all the priests in Galatia ought to be so likewise. I will, therefore, that you persuade, and even compel, all the priests in Galatia to live soberly, otherwise do you depose them from the priestly office, unless they, and their wives, and children, and servants, do religiously worship the gods, and also forbear to converse with the servants, children, and wives of the Galileans, who are impious toward the gods, and prefer impiety to religion.—You are likewise to order them not to frequent the theater, nor to drink in taverns, nor to exercise any mean or sordid employments.—Such as hearken to your directions, you are to encourage; others you are to reject. You are also to erect hospitals in every city, that strangers also may share in our humanity; and not only those of our own religion, but others likewise, if they are necessitous.' He then tells him what allowance he had made for that purpose. 'For,' says he, 'it is a shame when there are no beggars among the Jews, and the impious Galileans relieve not only their own people, but ours also, that our poor should be neglected by us, and left helpless and destitute."

"After all," says Julian, "these (Galileans) have in some degree a proper sense of religion, for they worship no abject and vulgar deity, but that God who is truly all-powerful and all good, by whose direction the sensible world is conducted; the same I am persuaded that we also worship, under different names. They therefore seem to me to act very consistently, as they are not transgressors of the laws, but only err in paying their worship to this one God, in neglect of all the rest, and in thinking that we only, whom they style the Gentiles, are precluded from his influence."

These testimonies are as worthy of the attention of the christian public, as of the skeptics; for, while they prove that neither infidel Jews, nor Pagans, nor apostates from the christian faith, in all their spite and malice, and with all the opportunities which they had, ever attempted to contradict one of the great facts on which christianity is founded; they also give some striking attestations to the

purity, excellency, and value of christianity, as received and practiced by the primitive christians. But the conclusion from these premises bearing upon the position before us (now, I hope, established in every mind in this assembly) which has led us so far into antiquity, is this—that the christian scriptures, and the facts which they record, were admitted by the enemies of christianity, as we now contend for them. But these infidels, like the modern, attempted to explain them away, to ridicule, or reproach them, as you have heard upon the present occasion, but, with what success, let the page of history, and our own experience, declare.—I will only add, that I see in my friend Mr. Owen, only a second edition of Celsus, in some respects abridged, and in others enlarged and improved. He dare not to deny the *facts*, but philosophizes against them, because repugnant to his Epicurean notions of matter, virtue and happiness.

These old skeptics reasoned against Jesus being Lord of the universe, and against his religion, just as a modern atheist reasons against the proposition, *that God made this globe*. A benevolent being could not create a world like this. See how badly it is planned, arranged, and adapted to the subsistence of animals. One part of it parched with a vertical sun; another bound in perpetual ice. One part of it dreary wastes, sandy deserts, and three-fourths of the whole immense oceans. They have formed, in their own imagination, a standard of benevolence, and that will not apply to the appearance of things—and it is more consistent with the pride of philosophy to annihilate a creator, than to sacrifice their own imaginations to reason. So with these primitive skeptics; they opposed their own ideas, or their own superstition, to incontestable facts; and rather than abandon the former, they thought good to attempt to explain away the latter.

Two facts are established from the preceding documents and proofs—our adversaries themselves, being judges:

1. All christian communities, from A. D. 33 to 101, whether previously Jews or Pagans, or both, to whom these writings were addressed, did receive and retain these writings, as the works of the persons whose names they bear.

2. That all the opponents of christianity whose works have come down to us—or whose arguments have been preserved in the writings of their opponents, did admit the gospel histories to have been written by their reputed authors; did admit the facts recorded—and never dared to question either the authorship of the inspired books, the time or place of their publication, or the verity of the facts stated by the eye and ear witnesses of the word.

While on the subject of the authorship of these sacred writings, and on the incontrovertible nature of the facts stated in these narratives, I would think it not unsuitable, in this place, to take notice of the character of these writers, and the *circumstantiality* of their narrations.

The question now before us, is: Does the character of these writers, as it presents itself to our view, from their own writings, or from any records which have come down to us, afford any ground to suspect either their *sincerity*, or any moral defect whatever? There is a species of evidence, sometimes called the *internal* evidence of christianity. This is made up from the character of the writers, the particulars of style and sentiment exhibited, and also from the nature, object, and tendency of the doctrine taught, or the communications made. There is what is sometimes called the *critical internal* evidence; and the *moral internal* evidence. I am not, however, going into this matter at present. I only remark, that, although the internal evidence, found within the volume, is not supposed the best calculated to arrest the attention of the bold, declaiming infidel, or the curious speculating skeptic; yet this is the evidence which ever has made the deepest impression upon the mind of the honest inquirer; and affords a much greater assurance to the believer of the certainty of the foundation of his faith, than all the external proofs which have ever been adduced. The moral internal evidence of christianity, is that which takes hold of the great mass of mankind, because it seizes the soul of man; it adapts itself to the whole man. It speaks to the understanding, to the conscience, to the affections, to the passions, to the circumstances, of man, in a way which needs no translation, no comment. It pierces the soul of man, dividing even the animal life from our intellectual nature, and developing the thoughts and intents of the heart. There is an internal sense to which it addresses itself, which can feel, examine, weigh, and decide upon its pretensions without pronouncing a word.

In silencing, confuting, confounding, and converting the bold opposer with a hard heart and a seared conscience, we do take hold of those strong, stubborn, and prostrating arguments, drawn from what we sometimes call the *extrinsic* sources. But when we aim at converting the great mass of mankind, we only think of laying open the internal evidences. In the former case, we begin by proving that God speaks; but, in the latter, we assume the fact, and prove it from what is spoken. That God speaks, ten thousand vouchers in the volume declare—none of which can be refuted. These are they which assure the christian that his faith will never make him ashamed.

But I will speak of the *circumstantiality* of the writers, that I may illustrate their *sincerity*. When a person attempts to impose upon us, he sometimes deals in generals, and avoids particulars. He keeps out to sea. He takes care not to deal much in dates, times, persons, and places of easy reference. He fears nothing more than specific terms, and minute details. But as there is a peculiar air of design, intrigue, imposture, or fiction, so there is an air of frankness, candor, honesty, sincerity, which it is as difficult to counterfeit, as to change the lineaments of the face. There is the physiognomy of truth. Sometimes it is mimicked. A labored minuteness instead of

the unaffected details, an artificial particularity instead of the natural and incidental relation of circumstances, frequently, in works of fiction, assume much of their air of truth; but never so exact is the imitation as to escape the detection of the well informed and accurate examiner. A secret consciousness of merited suspicion will always blush through the most labored concealment. But the consciousness of truth, will, without a challenge, court investigation, and defy contradiction. There is an air of this sort which accompanies conscious truth, that never can be perfectly counterfeited. This fearlessness of consequences, this eager desire of examination, this courting of contradiction, is the most prominent feature in the character of all the original witnesses who attest the evangelical story. They take a range in their narratives, quite unnecessary, and go into circumstantial details, allusions to persons, places, and public events, which no necessity compelled, were it not that they defied doubt, and solicited examination. When they record a miracle, they go into a detail of circumstances, which renders *rational doubt* impossible. The witnesses of many of the miracles were very numerous, and in recording them, they challenge, as it were, and summon all the witnesses. Such, for example, was the fact in that sublime miracle of feeding five thousand men upon five barley loaves and two small fishes. The place where, the time of year when, and many circumstances connected with this occurrence, put it in the power of each one of the five thousand, and, consequently, in the power of myriads of their cotemporaries, to contradict and repel such a falsehood, if it had been one. But the conversations of the enemies, the deeds and sayings of the opponents, the objections and complaints of Scribes and Pharisees, are frequently detailed along with the cause which elicited them. All of which afforded the most ready means of detection.

No country more than Judea, and no age more than the era of Jesus Christ and his apostles, made it difficult to pass off a forgery, if the impostors should be copious in their allusions to the events of the time and place. Now, the apostles and historians were most minute and copious in their allusions. But whence did this difficulty arise? Because the Jews were the most captious people, and the most conversant in all questions affecting their religious standing and character; because at that time there was an expectation that the Messiah should be born—and because the land of Judea experienced so many vicissitudes in its political relations, during the time this scene of things was exhibited. At the commencement of the period of the evangelical story, it constituted a part of a kingdom under Herod the great. Then it came under the dominion of Archelaus, under new arrangements; then it passed under the direct administration of the Roman government; the exaltation of Herod Agrippa to the sovereign power of his grandfather, for a time interrupted this order of things; and finally it is left in the form of a province, when the history of the New Testament closes. The surrounding countries

also partook of similar changes in their forms of government. Now it would have been dangerous in the extreme for any impostors, living in any other country, or even in the same country, forty years after the close of the New Testament story, to have attempted to forge such a story, and antedate it even forty years; especially as the prominent characters of this story had much to do in the ecclesiastical judicatories of these times, and to appear before several of the magistrates and governors then in office under the Roman emperors. No man could now write the history of any prominent individual living in New Jersey some forty years ago, full of incident and allusion to the families and individuals of the neighborhood, and now pass it off for a work of the period which it pretended to describe. I ask, could such an attempt possibly escape detection, especially if copious in allusions and references to the manners, customs, and leading personages of the day? But how much more difficult if, in that period, four or five changes in the government had taken place, and in the public management of its political concerns? It would have been impossible for the writings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, to have survived their authors, had they either been a record of false facts, or a disguised, perverted representation of facts which had occurred. It would exhaust your patience, my friends, and our strength, to attempt, were we now adequate to the task, to detail the allusions, references, and appeals to the illustrious personages, to the customs and institutions, Roman and Jewish, which then existed in that land and circumjacent country, and which are found in the historical books alone of the New Testament. I will just give you one example of the circumstantial minuteness of these historians, which may suffice for a specimen of what might be exhibited, were we to devote our attention to such development. I will only premise that, as the circumstance of having four historians gives us the opportunity of cross-examination, so the allusions to Jewish, Roman, and other usages, give us the opportunity of cross-examining the sacred with the profane historians and writers of that day, of which we rejoice to state there are not a few.

The example to which I refer, is the trial, condemnation, and crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Seven or eight allusions to persons, customs, and usages, which the sacred writers never explain, are found in the accounts of this trial, which will bear a cross-examination with all the authentic records of these times. Chalmers notices them in the following manner:

"The fact that they are borne out in their minute and incidental allusions by the testimony of other historians, gives a strong weight of what has been called circumstantial evidence in their favor. As a specimen of the argument, let us confine our observations to the history of our Savior's trial, and execution, and burial. They brought him to Pontius Pilate. We know both from Tacitus and Josephus, that he was at that time governor of Judea. A sentence

from him was necessary, before they could proceed to the execution of Jesus; and we know that the power of life and death was usually vested in the Roman governor. Our Savior was treated with derision; and this we know to have been a customary practice at that time, previous to the execution of criminals, and during the time of it. Pilate scourged Jesus before he gave him up to be crucified. We know from ancient authors, that this was a very usual practice among the Romans. The account of an execution generally ran in this form: He was stripped, whipped, and beheaded, or executed. According to the evangelists, his accusation was written on the top of the cross; and we learn from Suetonius and others, that the crime of the person to be executed was affixed to the instrument of his punishment. According to the evangelists, this accusation was written in three different languages; and we know from Josephus that it was quite common in Jerusalem to have all public advertisements written in this manner. According to the evangelists, Jesus had to bear his cross; and we know, from other sources of information, that this was the constant practice of these times. According to the evangelists, the body of Jesus was given up to be buried at the request of friends. We know that, unless the criminal was infamous, this was the law, or the custom with all Roman governors.

"These, and a few more particulars of the same kind, occur within the compass of a single page of the evangelical history. The circumstantial manner of the history affords a presumption in its favor, antecedent to all examination into the truth of the circumstances themselves. But it makes a strong addition to the evidence, when we find, that in all the subordinate parts of the main story, the evangelists maintain so great a consistency with the testimony of other authors, and with all that we can collect from other sources of information, as to the manners and institutions of that period. It is difficult to conceive, in the first instance, how the inventor of a fabricated story would hazard such a number of circumstances, each of them supplying a point of comparison with other authors, and giving to the inquirer an additional chance of detecting the imposition. And it is still more difficult to believe, that truth should have been so artfully blended with falsehood in the composition of this narrative, particularly as we perceive nothing like a forced introduction of any one circumstance. There appears to be nothing out of place, nothing thrust in with the view of imparting an air of probability to the history. The circumstance upon which we bring the evangelists into comparison with profane authors, is often not intimated in a direct form, but in the form of a slight or distant allusion. There is not the most remote appearance of its being fetched or sought for. It is brought in accidentally, and flows in the most natural and undesigned manner out of the progress of the narrative."

But as from the extraordinary *circumstantiality* of these historians and writers, so from every lineament of their character, from every

action of their lives, from all their labors and sufferings in the cause, we may derive irrefragable proofs of their *sincerity*. To the whole phenomena of the characters of the original witnesses, it has been often objected, or rather insinuated, that men have been frequently moved by pride of opinion, the hope of reward, by avarice or ambition, to feign characters, and impose upon the credulity of the world: that it is not improbable but that the original reporters and publishers of christianity conspired together, from some of these sinister motives, to impose upon the credulity of posterity. Singular conspiracy indeed! A conspiracy to make mankind just, merciful, pure, forgiving, and affectionate to one another; to teach them to live in accordance with human nature, its origin, and its destiny; to fix all their supreme hopes upon objects unseen and future; and to deny themselves of all unhallowed gratifications! Singular conspiracy on the part of the conspirators, to forsake all earthborn interests, to expose themselves to shame, persecution, and death, for making mankind pure and happy; to court infamy with those in power, and to render themselves obnoxious to the indignation of all the reputed wise, religious, and honorable among men! Astonishing conspiracy, which promises to the conspirators the absence of all worldly good, and the presence of all temporal evils, in proportion as they would be successful in accomplishing the objects for which they had conspired!

Any suspicion or conjecture against the founders of christianity, drawn from any document upon earth, christian or infidel, is as unreasonable as Atheism itself.

Viewed in whatever light we may, the Apostles, and first propagators of christianity, are the most extraordinary men the world ever saw. As historical writers and laborers in the establishment of christianity, they leave a character perfectly *sui generis*. They appear to have been selected, not only because they were obscure and illiterate, but because they were men of the humblest capacity. I have often admired the wisdom of the founder in selecting such advocates of his cause. He wanted *eye-witnesses* and *ear-witnesses*, and selected men from a calling which was more favorable to the production of good eyes and ears than perhaps any other. Good eyes and ears were better qualifications for the original Apostles, than all the learning and talents of the Archbishops of York and Canterbury. Good eyes, good ears, and a good memory, were the only indispensable qualifications to constitute such witnesses as Jesus Christ required. The most important part of their office was, to identify the person of Jesus Christ, and to attest the fact of his resurrection from the dead. To know his voice, and to distinguish his person, were matters of more consequence than most of us imagine. In truth, upon this depended the proof of the very fact upon which all christianity rests, viz: the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Now, I ask, what school more favorable to qualify men for such an office, than the fisherman's life? Men whose ears and whose eyes

are accustomed to the open air, by night and day; to the roaring of the billows, and who are constantly observing the face of nature, are the most likely to possess those senses in the greatest perfection. And ridicule the idea who may, I will contend that good eyes and good ears were first-rate qualifications in an Apostle—*a defect in either would have made them perfectly incompetent to the duties of the office.*

But this was not all. He wanted plain, unlettered men; men rather approaching to dullness than to acuteness of intellect; that ingenuity itself might not be able to attach suspicion to their testimony. They were neither fluent nor intelligent. They had no personal charms derived from learning or talent. On the other hand, it appears, from their frequent colloquies with Jesus, that they were uncommonly dull of apprehension. Had the original witnesses, whose first duty it was to identify the person of Jesus, and to prove his resurrection, been men so acute and learned as Paul, educated in the best schools of that day, and possessed of such a knowledge of men and things, some might have attributed their success more to *natural* than to *supernatural* aids.

The duty of the original eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses, who were to identify the person, narrate the miracles, and repeat the discourses of the Messiah, in all their first embassies, was to proclaim a few facts without comment, and to enforce the necessity of *reformation*, because of the advent of the Messiah, and the approach of his *reign*. He did not send them, as some suppose, to make orations or sermons upon texts of scripture, but to proclaim that the era of reformation had arrived, and to confirm their proclamation by miraculous benefits bestowed promiscuously upon all.

There never was such a model of finished human testimony, since or before, as that which the New Testament exhibits; in which no human being, how ingenious or malicious soever, can find a flaw, or even a weakness.

Let us for a moment glance at another of its grand characteristics. First comes the rough, bold, and zealous Baptist, just dressed up to the taste of the times. To understand this singular appearance of John, you must recollect that the Jewish people were at this time divided into two religious sects, the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees were the most numerous and decent religionists in their day. The Sadducees were the most wealthy class of the Jewish nation, and indulged themselves in all sensual pleasures. Like the rich generally, they wished for no future state, and fondly believed there was none. They had not much moral influence with the people on these accounts. But the Pharisees had. Now it was more necessary that the pretensions of John should be favorably regarded by the Pharisees than the Sadducees; for if favorably received by the Pharisees, the more general would be the reception of the Messiah by the whole nation. Now the Pharisees placed the highest degree of sanctity, just in such a demeanor, dress, and

manner of life, as John the Baptist assumed. Thus he dressed himself to the taste of those who could give the most influence to his message. Hence we find that so soon as his preaching, dress, food, and manner of life, were known, the Jews in Jerusalem deputed very honorable characters, both Priests and Levites, to wait upon him to hear his testimony, and to report it in the metropolis. Thus the testimony of John in favor of the Messiah was favorably announced through Judea, and to the nation. In all respects the testimony of the harbinger wonderfully accords with that of the testimony of the twelve original Heralds, both in its general character and accompaniments.

But with regard to the testimony of the twelve original witnesses, I have to remark, that not one of them understood for years either the nature or design of the mission of Jesus. This fact, if correctly understood, and applied, is of immense importance to the christian public in correcting some mistakes into which they have fallen, and it gives very great additional weight to the testimony of the Apostles, respecting the capital item in the Record, viz: the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. They all, without exception, expected the Messiah would found an earthly kingdom, and reign over it forever. Their imaginations pictured out to them the mighty conquests, and illustrious victories they would achieve under him. Even the most gifted saints who departed not from the temple, when they first saw the wonderful child moved by the Holy Spirit, as it spake in the ancient prophets (not always understood by them whose tongues uttered its suggestions) expressed their joy and hopes in such strains as indicated expectations similar to those of his disciples—"that we," said they, "being *delivered from our enemies*, might worship him *without fear* all the days of our lives." They, one and all, expected an all-conquering king, in the person of Jesus. Hence so much of the war spirit in some of the Apostles, and so much worldly ambition in the mother of Zebedee's sons. Let my two sons, said she, sit, good master, one on your right, and the other on your left, when you ascend the throne. A crucified Messiah was as far from her thoughts, as the day of judgment is now from the anticipations of Mr. Owen. Not a man or woman on earth, till within a few days of the event, could understand or brook the idea of the crucifixion of Jesus.

I do not say that the Apostles were quite disinterested in leaving their occupations to follow Jesus. This diminishes naught from their testimony. They expected he was able to reward them; and that he would reward them. They looked for something in this world when they first set out as volunteers in his cause. Peter says: "Now Lord, what shall we have, who have forsaken all, and followed you?" He made him a liberal promise which pleased him and his associates too. But this promise, even then, they misapplied. When he told them, without a figure, that he would be crucified, they could not believe it, so contrary was the issue of his life to their expectations. And when the Roman soldiers and the chief priests

came to take him before the Sanhedrim, Peter was more disposed to fight than to surrender. In a word, the whole company of the disciples of Jesus, male and female, were *disappointed* when Jesus was crucified. Fear and consternation seized them all. Peter acted the coward, and they all fled. Even on the day of his resurrection, while two of them were going from Jerusalem to Emmaus, they spoke of his demise as a complete frustration of all their hopes. "We *expected*," said they, "that *he would have redeemed Israel*." But, alas! we are disappointed. He has not redeemed Israel, was their conviction at that moment. A temporal redemption was their expectation. And as for his resurrection from the dead, so far from plotting any story about it, it was the farthest thought from their mind; the female disciples were preparing to embalm the body, when they found the grave empty; and when they told the disciples that "*the Lord was risen indeed*," their "words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not."

Now this being the expectation of these witnesses, as every document on earth proves—to suppose them capable of plotting and executing such a fraud, as the stealing of the body, betrays the grossest ignorance of the whole history of the times, of the nation, and of the Apostles. Nothing can be more plain than that when Joseph the Senator petitioned the Governor for the body, and interred it, the hopes and prospects of the disciples, as respected worldly objects, were buried in the same grave with it.

Hence the incredulity of all the Apostles at first hearing of his resurrection, and the stubborn incredulity of Thomas, who happened to be absent when the Lord appeared to the others—*I will not believe*, said he. I would not believe my own eyes; for unless I handled him and felt the wounds made by the spear and the nails, I would not, I could not, believe. But a single sight of Jesus overcame all his resolution, and he is constrained to exclaim, *My Lord and my God!*

But as I am brought forward to this most wonderful of all events, *the resurrection of Jesus Christ*, which is, too, the capital item in the apostolic testimony; and the fact on which the whole religion, and hopes of christianity depend and terminate, I feel strongly disposed to show that this is the best attested fact in the annals of the world. For I wish to have it placed upon record, and to be known as far as this work ever shall extend, either in time or place, that in our view, the shortest and best, because the most irrefragable way, to prove the whole truth and absolute certainty of the christian religion, is to prove the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This proved, and Deism, Atheism, and Skepticism of every name, fall prostrate to the ground. The Atheist will himself say, let this be proved, that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, walked upon this earth, eat, drank, and talked with men for *forty* days afterward, and, in the presence of many witnesses, ascended up into Heaven, and after his ascent thither, sent down infallible proofs that he was well received in the Heavenly world, and I will believe.

I beg the indulgence of this assembly here. I wish to be diffuse on this one point. I desire it for the sake of every saint and sinner here—or who may read this discussion. I will aim at doing more than proving the fact, though this shall be kept continually in view. This fact proved, and all is proved. This is not a conclusion to which I have come from my own reasoning merely, nor from my own experience, though both lead to it. It is a conclusion to which the wisest of christians have been led. But that which gives the casting vote in the court of my understanding, is the fact that Paul sets the example.

Paul was not one of the original twelve. He was not chosen to be a companion of Jesus, to be an eye and ear-witness of what Jesus said and did. He was called to attest and proclaim the truth of christianity to the world; to the pagan world, savage and civilized. All gentile nations were embraced in his commission. *He saw Jesus*, after he had spent some months or years in persecuting him. Now the question is, how did this astonishing man argue the truth of christianity against the philosophic Greek, Epicurean, or Stoic? How did he plead its truth with Barbarian, Scythian, noble and ignoble. To ascertain this, we must follow him from Jerusalem to Athens, from Athens to Rome, from city to city, from nation to nation; and after mingling with his congregations in all places, we shall hear him rest all upon the fact of Christ's resurrection. Begin where, and with whom he may, here always he makes his stand.

We shall just hear him in Athens.—"Athenians," says he, "you are in all things too much addicted to the worshiping of demons. I see that you have erected an altar to the *unknown God*. This being whom you worship without knowing him, I now declare to you: God that made the world and all things therein, seeing he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with human hands, neither is he served as though he needed anything; seeing he gives to all life, and breath, and all things, and has made of one blood all the nations of men who inhabit the earth; now one of your own poets hath said—"*For we his offspring are.*"—Now let me reason with you on your own principles. If we are the offspring of the Deity, there must be some similitude betwen him and us, as between parent and child.—We can walk, and speak, and act; but your gods are dumb, and cannot move. They have no seeing eye, nor hearing ear, else the spiders would not spin their threads over their eyes, and weave their webs over their ears. Yet, you say, "We are the offspring of God." Thus 'tis easy to refute their superstition. But after pulling down their fine air-built speculations, he appears in the majesty of the gospel. He announces the Divine proclamation. This ignorant superstition of yours, God, says he, has hitherto overlooked; but now he commands *all men* everywhere TO REFORM. Reformation and remission of sins, he proclaims and enjoins. These he connects with the day of judgment:—for, con-

tinues he, he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world, by that person whom he has constituted judge of living and dead, concerning which matters he has given proof, faith, or assurance to all the world, by RAISING HIM FROM THE DEAD. Here he stands: this proves the whole mission of Jesus, and his appointment to be the supreme Judge. They had heard him talk about the *anastasis* in the market-place; but not knowing the resurrection of the dead, they supposed this *anastasis* was a god or goddess which Paul had proclaimed. But let it be remembered, that not only in the market-place with the Epicureans and Stoics, but when amid the *Areopagus*, or aldermen of the city, he makes the all-conquering proof of his doctrine, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

But that I may argue the truth of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, in your presence, with the greatest possible effect on this promiscuous audience, let me take another argument from this Apostle as my text. Permit me to open the New Testament:

1 Cor. xv. You will find Paul in argument with some disciple of Epicurus, or some Sadducean dogmatist. We shall hear him state the *old gospel* which he so successfully proclaimed. This old gospel was not so full of dogmas and opinions as some of the modern.—We have become so *spiritual* that our religion is rather a religion of *opinions* than of *facts*. Angels can live on opinions, or abstract truths, for aught I know; but so soon as mortals begin to live on opinions, they become lean. The primitive christians believed facts, reposed in them, and drew their joys from them. But let us hear Paul state *his gospel*—"Moreover, brethren, I will declare that gospel to you, which I once proclaimed among you, which you then received as true, in which you now profess to stand; and by which YOU ARE SAVED, provided you hold it in your memory, unless forsooth, 'tis all a lie, and in so believing it, you have believed in vain."—"I delivered to you when I first came to Corinth, this gospel—1st. That Jesus Christ died for our sins; 2d. That he was buried; and, in the third place, that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures." This was the beginning, middle, and end, of Paul's gospel; whether it suit or non suit the fastidious taste of the times.—He proceeds to prove the third fact, not so much to prove it, as to argue from it, as an established fact, one admitted by all the congregation of Corinth, and by myriads of christians throughout the world.

Old Plato reasoned about the *immortality* of the soul; but in the genuine spirit of christianity, Paul avers that Jesus Christ brought *life and immortality* to our bodies. The dispute among the Jews was not about the immortality of the soul; but, Shall the generations of the dead ever come back again? This was the question which the Pharisees and the Sadducees argued. This is the grand point which must be always kept in view. Only show me the man, who, on the testimony of the Apostles and prophets, believes that Jesus

Christ rose from the dead, and I will engage to show you a christian, not only in faith, but in works. A belief in this fact is the *fons et principium* of christianity—the source from which the practice of all christian virtues must be derived. This is the principle which leavens the whole mass — this is the balm of Gilead, the cordial which calms, and cheers, and comforts the heart.

A person may believe opinions (it is, however, a misapplication of the term *believe*) until his soul freezes or falls asleep (pardon the expression). Facts, testimony, and faith, belong to the same chapter; and the last can only be in company with the former two. But we shall soon wander from the point before us. The old gospel was summarily comprehended in *these three facts*. The meaning of these facts is, what is called *the doctrine* of Christ.

Paul proceeds to state the evidence on which the third fact was proclaimed in Corinth. He states a number of times that Jesus was seen alive; first by Cephas, then by all the apostles; then by five hundred disciples at one time; then by James; then by all the apostles; and last of all he was seen by himself. The number of times and witnesses greatly transcend all that is ever required to prove any fact. He, however, simply asserts the fact of his having been seen so often and by so many witnesses, the majority of whom are appealed to *as still living*. We have the fact of his resurrection here asserted, and the evidence adduced. Now for the argument derived from the evidence submitted. To estimate the weight of this, let it be remembered that Paul had some bitter enemies in Corinth. These were the old materialists, the Sadducees. Very like my friend Mr. Owen, they held to no spirit, resurrection, or future state. Now, as opposers of the apostle, they would be disposed to detect, if possible, any error, weakness, flaw, or falsehood in the argument. Mark how he challenges them—"*How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?*" They had insulted him. He does not spare them. Surely in the polished, shrewd, and captious city of Corinth, which Cicero compliments as the *lumen totius Graeciæ*, the *eye of all Greece*—surely, I say, if Paul is vulnerable, if his facts are false, if his argument be inconclusive, the "*eye of all Greece*" will see it; and the wounded pride of his opponents will publish it to the world.

"When I came to you first, did I not proclaim the resurrection of Jesus? Did I not prove it? Did you not believe it? Why then deny the resurrection of the dead saints; for both stand or fall together. If the dead saints are not raised, then why was Christ raised? and you know if he was not raised, and we affirmed that he was, we are found liars; our preaching, and your faith are both vain. You are yet in your sins.

"Did I not tell you, *he was seen by me also?* Why did you believe me? Were not the signs of an apostle with me? Beside, you knew my history. The Jews all knew it; and some of you are acquainted with it. I am proud to confess it was not my education, nor the circumstances which surrounded me from birth to manhood, which made

me what I am. I was born a Jew, and all my prospects were Jewish. My ancestors on both sides were Jews. My preceptor, Gamaliel, was a learned doctor of the Jewish law; I was educated in the metropolis at his feet. I was intimate with the whole sanhedrim. I was brought up in the greatest antipathy against Jesus and the christians. I became a persecutor as soon as I finished my education. I went even to strange cities in pursuit of christians, male and female. All this, my education and the circumstances which surrounded me from birth to manhood, prompted me to. But contrary to the influence of both, by the evidence which I have detailed to you, I was constrained to renounce these vicious influences, and to proclaim the faith which you have received."

We shall now let Paul plead his own cause with the Corinthian materialists.

He opens the case—he asserts the fact—*Jesus rose from the dead.* He summons the witnesses. They depose that they saw the same identical person who was crucified and buried, alive again. That they had the most indubitable evidence of the fact of his resurrection. They saw him, handled him, eat with him, drank with him, and conversed with him, and saw him ascend into heaven.

Paul's first argument on the premises, is a *reductio ad absurdum.* You Sadducees, that are members of the congregation in Corinth, believed, and still declare your belief, of the above testimony, that Jesus rose from the dead. Now if you deny the future resurrection of the saints, you make the resurrection of Jesus of none account. For why should Christ alone rise to die no more, as one of the sons of men? If, then, you would prove that there is no resurrection of the dead, you must deny a fact which all christians admit, and which you yourselves admit upon the aforesaid evidence, namely, the undeniable fact of the resurrection of Jesus. To deny the resurrection of the dead, is, then, to deny your own acknowledged belief in the resurrection of Jesus.

2. Again, if Christ be not raised, our proclamation of the fact is false, and your belief predicated thereupon, is also false. This is another *reductio ad absurdum.*

3. Again, we have been false witnesses concerning God — when we said that he raised up Christ; if, indeed, your assertion is true, that the dead are not to be raised, we are not merely deceivers of men, but reproachers of God. This is inadmissible, as all our deeds declare.

4. Again, on your hypothesis, faith is *useless.* You are still in your sins. This is contrary to your own experience.

5. Also, all who have died for attesting their belief in Christ's resurrection, have thrown their lives away, and have actually, on your principles, *perished.*

6. And we, too, who are suffering shame, and hazarding our lives every day, for proclaiming this fact, are, of all men, the most miserable; for we gain nothing in this life, as you yourselves know, but

stripes, reproaches, and dangers, for publishing the fact of his resurrection. If we should have to fight with the wild beasts at Ephesus for the amusement of our adversaries, what would be the avails, if there be no resurrection, or future state?

7. But, again, what is more reasonable, upon your own principles, believing, as you do, the five books of Moses, than that all the saints, by one man, should live again, seeing that by a man they all die.

8. But, in the last place, if you will not admit the truth of the resurrection of the dead, your creed ought to be reduced to the standard of the brute; and, like them, make eating and drinking, and all animal enjoyments, the all-engrossing concern of life. For death will soon reduce us back, upon your principles, to senseless matter. So reasons the apostle Paul with the Sadducean materialists, who lived too soon to deny the resurrection of Jesus, but not too soon to question the ultimate resurrection of the dead.

I ought, perhaps, to apologize to some present, for the manner in which we connect the argument of the Apostle in this chapter. You must know that we do not subscribe to that system of text-preaching which authorizes a man to make as many sermons as there are verses in a chapter; and oftentimes these sermons on these texts are as detached from the scope on which they stand, as if the whole New Testament was a book of proverbs. Hence we cannot agree with him who makes these words, "if in this life only we have hope by Christ, we are of all men the most miserable," a text to prove that all the rich and honorable christians in this day are of all men the most miserable; nor with him who makes these words: "As by Adam all die, even so by Christ shall all be made alive," a proof that all men, good and evil, shall be forever happy. This text-preaching, which has made the Bible the most unmeaning book in the world, has contributed much to make such men as Mr. Owen skeptics. Indeed the sects and parties which now exist, built, as they are, upon *text-taking* and *sermon-making*, are the most formidable weapons with which the skeptics attack the citadel of truth. But yet they might as reasonably blame the sun for all the darkness now on this globe, as charge christianity with such perversions as those to which we now allude.

Luther and Calvin began a great reformation, and ever since we have been quarreling about what Luther and Calvin meant; and thus people get to hating one another on account of religious opinions. Whenever men will make the belief of *christian facts*, and not an *argument in abstruse opinions*, or in the inferential reasonings of some orthodox commentator, the bond of christian union, divisions, and all their evil concomitants, will cease; but so long as christians demand unity of opinion, or a concurrence in the conclusion of some philosophic or speculative mind, essential to christian faith and christian character, so long will discords and divisions abound.

Skeptics sometimes boast that they are more courteous to those who differ from them than christians. So well they may boast! But there is not so much real cause of triumph in this matter as we suppose. They feel so little interest in all things pertaining to a future state, that it gives them no concern what any person thinks about it. But christians feel so much at stake, so vast an interest in all religious matters, that I can excuse them much more easily for being somewhat warmed at times, than I can praise the stoical apathy of the skeptics. If I were a materialist, I might be as courteous, and as indifferent to the opinions of others, as my friend Mr. Owen. But should I ever appear to feel any more in earnest than he, it must be attributed to the greater interest I feel in all matters which are connected with immortality. It rouses a christian to make him a bankrupt by a quibble—to rob him of the hope of immortal glory. While I disclaim all sectarianism, and all sectarian feeling, I would be the last to compliment away for a smile a single filing of sacred truth.

But to return to the close of the Apostle's most triumphant argument with the Sadducean materialist.

What could induce us to die every day—to rise every morning determined to die, if called upon, rather than to deny the truth which we promulge? What could induce us not only to hazard death, but, while we live, to be accounted the offscouring of the earth, and the filth of all things; to suffer hunger, nakedness, and stripes, for attesting and promulging falsehoods? Has ever the like occurred? If we be deceivers knowingly, and in such a case as this, if deceivers, we must be *designedly* so—do we not bear false witness in the presence of God, and do we not expose ourselves to the severest punishment? We must willingly prefer pain to happiness, if we are deceivers; for pain is our present earthly gain, and pain must be our future reward. We are, then, not only of all men the most miserable here, but must be so hereafter! It cannot be: we must cease to be accounted human beings before we can be accounted deceivers.

But, says some skeptic (for Mr. Owen fails to make objections, and we will make them for him), how many thousands have suffered death in attestation of false religions? How many have suffered themselves to be burned, or crushed to pieces under the ponderous car of Juggernaut, in attestation of their religion? Will you, then, make the martyrdom and sufferings of the ancient witnesses a proof of the verity of their religion, and reject the same as proof of the truth of many pagan, and, what you would call, anti-christian religions? This is something like you christians; but it is a good rule which works both ways; and if you will prove christianity to be divine, because some of its votaries suffered, you will be able to prove all the religions of the world divine, for the same reason, for some of their votaries suffered.

Not so fast with your conclusion. All that we contend for is, that martyrdom proves the *sincerity* of the witness. This is all we want.

Now we all admit that a man may be *sincerely* wrong in his opinions, and so misled as to die for them rather than to retract. But if, in matters of fact, such as the assassination of Julius Cæsar, such as the death of Napoleon, or the Battle of Bunker's Hill, where the fact is submitted to all the senses, our senses could not be relied on, there would be an end to all certainty in the world. Now, when a person is so fully persuaded of such facts as to die in attestation of them, the death of such a person is not only a proof of his *sincerity*, but of *the fact*, because it is an object of sensible proof, in which there was no possibility of deception.

The martyr to an opinion, in dying, says: *I sincerely think*. But the martyr to a fact, in dying, says: *I most assuredly saw*, or *I certainly heard*. Now the possibility of thinking wrong, even after having thought for years, is quite conceivable; but the possibility of seeing or hearing wrong, or not seeing or hearing at all, when opportunities have been frequent, and every way favorable, is inconceivable. A person who sees an object only once, or hears a narrative only once, can with difficulty be deceived or misled: but where an object has been repeatedly addressed to the eye, or to the ear, deception is not to be supposed. Every man may test this principle by inquiring how much more certain he is that a friend is dead whom he saw expire, than he is of the truth of any opinion derived from the mere comparison of abstract propositions.

It was for publishing facts, *sensible facts*, and not for propagating opinions, that all the original martyrs suffered and died. Martyrdom, therefore, proves the sincerity of the martyr, who dies for an opinion, but it proves the truth of the fact, when a person dies in attestation of a sensible fact.*

But so soon as we have rebutted, and I hope refuted, the objection made to the superior credibility of the original witnesses, from the fact of their sufferings and martyrdom, I am assailed by another. Granted, for the moment, says some skeptic, that you have fairly made out the fact of Christ's resurrection, by the testimony of his

* Mr. Addison regards the courage and patience shown by these witnesses under their tortures as of itself supernatural and miraculous. "I cannot conceive (says he) a man placed in the burning chair at Lyons, amid the insults and mockery of the crowded ampitheater, and still keeping his seat; or stretched upon a grate over coals of fire, and breathing out his soul among the exquisite sufferings of such a tedious execution, rather than renounce his religion and blaspheme his Savior. Such trials seem to me above the strength of human nature, and able to overbear reason, duty, faith, conviction, nay, and the most absolute certainty of a future state. Humanity, unassisted in an extraordinary manner, must have shaken off the present pressure, and have delivered itself out of such dreadful distress, by any means that could have been suggested to it. We can easily imagine, that any person, in a good cause, might have laid down their lives at a gibbet, the stake, or the block—but to expire leisurely, among the most exquisite tortures, when they might have come out of them even by a mental reservation, or a hypocrisy which was not without the possibility of being followed by repentance and forgiveness, has something in it so far beyond the force and natural strength of mortals, that we cannot but think, that there *was* some miraculous power to support the sufferer."—*Reporter*.

friends; still there is a suspicion resting upon that testimony, just from the fact that all the witnesses were Christians. Let us have some skeptical Jew, or some skeptical Greek, affirming the fact—produce some respectable Roman author, like Tacitus or Suetonius, who affirms the same fact, and then you may claim our assent with more reason.

Strange illusion this, which compels a person to reject the better, and to believe the worst testimony. Now, why prefer the testimony of a man who will assert a great practical truth, and not accord with it in his behavior, to the testimony of another, who espouses the same truth and lives conformably to it? Does the fact of a person's living conformably to what he testifies, discredit his testimony? Yet this is precisely the logic of this objection. The man who cries fire, and sits in the burning house, is more to be believed, than the man who cries fire, and runs out of it! Now, suppose Tacitus had said that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, and that he believed it; would he not have been enrolled among the christians? And so of all others, Jews and Pagans. The instant they believe the fact, they would have ceased to be Jews and Pagans—they would have been embodied in the ranks of christians. So that a little common sense, or a little reflection, would have taught such a skeptic in christianity, that in asking for such evidence, he only asked for an impossibility—yes, an impossibility as great as to place two substances in the same spot in the same instant. If I could find a Pagan such as Tacitus, affirming that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, and he still continuing a Pagan, I would have said that he did not believe it himself, or else viewed it as an imperative opinion. Nay, indeed, we have infinitely better testimony than that of Tacitus, or a thousand such—for we have the testimony of Paul, and myriads of Jews and Greeks who lived in those times and places, and had access to the evidences, who were as hostile to christians and christianity, as any skeptics now can be; and yet, so overpowering was the evidence, that from enemies they became friends. Now, to a logician, every convert made to christianity, in those days, is a *disinterested* witness; and a most credible one too. For, if thousands of individuals, and of all ranks and degrees, Nicodemus and Joseph among the Jews, the Roman Proconsuls, the Athenian Mayor Dionysius, down through all the ranks in Judea, Greece, and Rome, and to the very slaves themselves, embraced at the peril of rank, fortune, and good name, of life and limb, the testimony of the Apostles living in their own times, with all the evidences triable by all the means which we could wish to have had—surely we have disinterested witnesses by the hundred, thousand, and myriad. I would not rank him among the sane in intellect, who would not admit that the *three thousand* on Pentecost, converted to the christian faith, with all the cotemporary converts, for twenty or thirty years, were disinterested witnesses. They were so. Their conversion was a proof of the facts attested, and their changing ranks made them only better

witnesses, than had they continued to admit the facts without being governed by them. I hope we shall hear no more about *disinterested* witnesses, when we have myriads of them to obey the summons.

The hour of adjournment, I am admonished, has arrived. Perhaps Mr. Owen wishes to be heard. Before I sit down, I would observe, that it is due to the community, to the importance of the subject, and to ourselves, that we should bring this subject to a legitimate close. Circumstances to which I have before alluded, have deprived me of bringing forward, say two-thirds of the documentary evidence I expected to offer. I do wish my friend, Mr. Owen, to pay the greatest attention, and to offer every objection he can frame to this argument. We entreat any other person present, who has any objection, to make it known, either by word or writing. We do confidently believe, that we are able to demonstrate, that we have not been following any cunningly devised fable, but that we are compelled, by every rational consideration, to admit the truth of the divine oracles; and to repose implicit faith on that grand fact on which the whole of christianity is established.

Mr. Campbell continues: Mr. Chairman—When interrupted, yesterday evening, by the arrival of the hour of adjournment, we were engaged in demonstrating the truth and certainty of the historic fact, on which is founded the christian religion. I mean the great fact of *the resurrection of the man, Christ Jesus, from the dead.* We progressed so far in the proof of this fact, as to show not only the testimony of the original witnesses themselves, but also the method in which they argued upon the evidence, and the reasons urged *why* their testimony should be accredited. The Apostles, we saw, presented themselves before the public as the most competent and credible witnesses that the world ever saw. They resembled, in no one point, persons carried away by enthusiasm, or attachment to opinions, about which honest men might differ, but as men whose sole business it was to proclaim *facts*, which had been submitted to the cognizance of all their senses. They do not merely affirm, that they only saw the Savior after his resurrection. They urge the matter, not only as affording ocular and audible, but every other kind of sensible proof. They proclaim that he repeatedly and familiarly conversed with them, for forty days; and that, during that time, he had, by many *infallible proofs*, shown himself to be the identical person whom they had seen crucified, and concerning whose identity there could not exist the shadow of a doubt. Their testimony differs, *toto cœlo*, from any testimony on the subject of speculative opinions.—Their sincerity is also a sincerity *sui generis*, of its own peculiar kind. The difference between martyrdom for tenacity of opinion, and for attestation of fact, we have shown to be immeasurable. Martyrdom is, in all cases, evidence of sincerity; in the former case, it only proves belief in, and tenacity of, principles; in the latter case, inasmuch as it is impossible for *all* the senses of man to be imposed upon, there cannot, in the nature of things, be any stronger

proof of the verity of a *sensible* fact, than to see men dying in attestation of it.

These men were never accused of any crime, except what grew out of the pernicious influence which a belief in this fact was supposed to have upon mankind. We shall show, from all the annals of ecclesiastic history, that their persecutions originated in a dread of the influence which the promulgation of these facts was supposed to possess. The sole misdemeanor charged upon them, was their fearless development of this fact.

We have stated that, on the morning of the first day of the week, the body was missing—we have shown that his resurrection was not anticipated by any of his disciples; that there was not an individual in the whole christian fraternity that had the remotest expectation of his resurrection. On the contrary, their expectation was that he would have redeemed Israel. This precludes all possibility of his friends stealing the body, for they could have no temptation to steal it.

We must look at the state of parties, at this time, in Jerusalem. They were divided into the opponents and friends of christianity. There were no neutrals. The abduction of the body can be accounted for only in two ways—1st. His friends must have been the thieves; but to give color to this suspicion, *they* must have anticipated such an influence upon society, as that which actually did result from the fact of the resurrection. But this, it has been shown, they never did anticipate. If, 2dly, his enemies had stolen the body and had it in their possession, they would have produced it, in order to confound the opposite party. Suppose that, on the day of Pentecost, when the influence of the fact of the resurrection first began to be remarked, that they had then the body in their possession, the bare production of it would have silenced the christians forever. The fact of the non-production of the body, by the enemies of Christ, proves, conclusively, that *they* had not got it.

The historians say, that the Jewish authorities placed a guard over the sepulcher. When the absence of the body was discovered, the sentinels, in their own exculpation, declared that his disciples stole him away while they slept. The story itself was incredible, and the author could, therefore, be no better.

But on analyzing the natural feelings, both of his enemies and friends, we can discover no motive which could prompt either of them to such an abduction. The whole accumulation of evidence is of such a character, that in order to estimate the exact weight of it, we must take into view all the circumstances of the case. We have not merely their naked assertion that they had seen the Savior. The weight of the evidence does not rest merely upon this statement; nor does it rest upon our inability to account for the absence of the body, and its resuscitation; although all the witnesses concurred, yet the proof rests not there. Though these testimonies all corroborate and support each other, still the sequence and depend-

ence of the facts, are so arranged in all the histories of these times, that the weight of the testimony rests not upon these alone, but upon circumstances of still greater moment, connected with these, viz: the personal sufferings of the disciples—the devotion of their whole lives to the attestation and promulgation of this fact. This is a very different kind of testimony from that of a man who should attest any particular fact, when the truth or falsehood of the fact could, in nowise, interest him. The concurrent testimony of a thousand persons in proof of any marvelous event, would not be the strongest evidence, if it were not an event of such a character, as ever afterward to exercise a paramount influence over their whole lives, and give birth to an entire change of conduct. But the naked assertion is but a small part of the evidence, compared with the principles which the fact itself necessarily involves. The twelve Apostles, and many of their coadjutors, who were the earliest converts to christianity, and some of whom had as fair a start in the race for honor and distinction; these individuals, I say, all go forward in attestation of a simple fact, and thereby expose themselves to not only the persecutions of the Jews, but also of the Romans; for they, also, began to be jealous of the christians. They suffered not only the loss of popularity with their countrymen, but they endangered themselves with the Sanhedrim, and with the Roman authorities. The motives which influenced them, in declaring this truth could have been of no ordinary character, since their attestation involved the sacrifice of every worldly interest. And not only this, but they were assured by the Savior that, for this very cause, they would be put to death. He told Peter that this cause would one day cost him his life.

Peter was not a brave man. He shows himself, in one instance, to be under the influence of the greatest weakness. He denies his Lord to save himself from persecution. These men were, without any remarkable exception, as great cowards as any that are to be found now-a-days. To be told, in the first instance, that their declaration of this truth would procure their persecution and death, was presenting the matter in such a light as would have overcome their resolution; but when once they had received the knowledge that the Lord had risen, they became as bold as lions. After this, we see Peter and John standing up in the Temple, and proclaiming this truth in open defiance of the whole Sanhedrim. Here we see that the influence of the belief of this fact of the resurrection made cowards brave. We see the timid Peter standing up boldly with his associates, men of no address, and with no arm of flesh to support them; yet they fearlessly proclaim the fact. They are put into prison; when released, they go back to the Temple and repeat the proclamation, and travel from place to place, in order to disseminate it far and wide; until, at last, the opposite party began to perceive that if they did not put forth all their power, the existing order of

things would be subverted by this sedition. To put a stop to the further spread of it, the disciples were martyrized.

There is nothing like this in the ancient or modern world. Here you see men acting contrary to all the ordinary principles of human conduct—men naturally timid, shaking off their timidity, and dying rather than recant their proclamation of a fact. They did not die for their tenacious attachment to any speculative opinion, but for asserting that they had seen their crucified Savior risen from the dead, etc. Having received those proofs, they risked and sacrificed life in order to attest and to promulgate the fact. The weight of the testimony does not consist in any of these circumstances alone, but in the whole body of the evidence, taken in connection with its inseparable adjuncts.

But we are not yet done with the proofs. There is no other historical fact of equal antiquity, that can be supported by one-thousandth part of the testimony that this is. There is no principle or criterion of evidence, but what is to be found in this attestation. Even experience contributes its share to make this matter of fact more clear than any other historic fact to be found in the annals of antiquity.

There now exists the institution of a day consecrated to the commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus. We are not aware of the peculiar force of this institution. Had there been no weekly appropriation of time before the resurrection of Jesus, the commencement of such an appropriation would be an infragable monument of the event. But still it is attended with more force than usually accompanies a new institution. There was the abolition of the seventh day among the first converts, as well as the appointment of the first. The seventh day was observed from Abraham's time, nay, from the creation. The Jews identified their own history with the institution of the Sabbath day. They loved and venerated it as a patriarchal usage. But it was not primarily observed on that account, for it was given to them as a part of their national compact. You will find the Lord enjoins the Sabbath day upon them with this preface: "I brought you out of the land of bondage; *therefore* keep the Sabbath holy." The observance of this day, therefore, is not so much to be regarded as a usage derived from the patriarchs as a divine national institution, intended to perpetuate the memory of that wonderful deliverance which the Lord had wrought out for them. Here, then, is a nation strongly attached to this institution of the Sabbath day, because their forefathers had observed it. We well know the powerful influence of ancient national customs. Men love them, nay, venerate them, because their forefathers were attached to them. But taking into view the re-enactment of that day, and the making it a part of the national institution, and we find the Sabbath existing in the most powerful force, and sanctioned by the highest authority. Now to abandon the observance of that day, as every christian did,

and to substitute a new day of the week, having a different object and view, was greatly more difficult than to originate an institution entirely new—more difficult than to institute it co-ordinately with the old Sabbath day, so as to perpetuate the observance of the first and the seventh day also. I presume that even christians have not sufficiently appreciated the import of this evidence. It would have been more easy to have superinduced the first day, and left the seventh day standing, because of its antiquity, and as an important part of the national covenant, than to change the day from the seventh to the first of the week. For these reasons, we perceive that it must have been much more difficult to abolish the old institution than to *originate* a new one.

You will remember that our Savior was frequently charged with not keeping the Sabbath; how often was he accused of Sabbath breaking? There was no disrespect of the Jewish ritual, so frequently charged upon him. How did he refute the accusation? Why, says he, the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath day. After his resurrection, he explained this, and other sayings; and we find no difficulty in understanding a *dictum* in which we recognize a principle entirely new, which is not referable to the decalogue, and which, in fact, abrogates that precept of it which enjoins the observance of the seventh day. It was not the seventh part of time, but the seventh day, which was claimed by the Lord in the first instance. The commandment was this: "But the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The reason assigned must be changed before the day of observance could be altered. "The Lord *rested* on the seventh day and hallowed it." We could not substitute the observance of the fifth for the fourth of July, because there exists no rational pretext for it. Not so with regard to the consecration of the seventh part of our time. But the substitution of the *first day* for the Jewish Sabbath was as positive an origination of a new religious institution as the feast of the passover, or pentecost, or circumcision, or any other part of the Jewish ritual. But what distinguished the first day of the week? And why was it set apart? Solely in commemoration of a new creation. The last Sabbath day was kept by Jews in the tomb; and it was so ordered as exactly to coincide with that symbolic representation of things which we find in the Old Testament. You shall not go out of your house on the Sabbath day; you shall rest within your house. Now the Savior did, through this day, lie in the grave. But the resurrection of Jesus on the first day of the week was the commencement of a new creation. Sublime as were the reasons which originally influenced the patriarchs to keep the Sabbath day, incomparably more sublime are those which now influence christians to observe it. Hence the institution and consecration of the first day of the week, in commemoration of the matter of fact that our Savior rose from the dead on the morning of that day, is a positive commemorative institution, in direct attestation of the truth of the matter of fact and of the

unspeakable importance of the occasion. This was not an event to be engraven on pillars of marble in order to perpetuate it, but upon the hearts of christians—for all christian hopes and joys must ever spring from it. It is a perpetual commemorative institution of the birth of immortal hope, of the dawn of life and immortality, upon the human race.

While examining the divine mission of Moses, we remarked that the *criteria* of the verity of historic facts were these: That the facts should have been sensible ones; should have been witnessed by many persons; should have some commemorative institutions; and that those commemorative institutions should have been continuous from the instant in which the facts took place, down to our own time. All these strictly apply to this institution. For we read, in the New Testament history, that from the day of his resurrection, the Lord himself honored its weekly return. This was the day in which he was wont to have interviews with his disciples. And from that day until now, all christians, Jews, and Gentiles, have celebrated it. To feel the force of the argument, let us place before our minds a Jew, zealous of the law of Moses, standing before a christian preacher. He is convinced of the fact of the resurrection, is baptized, and thus becomes a christian. In becoming a christian, he not only rejects the whole of the Jewish economy, but ceases to observe an institution as ancient as the creation, and becomes an observer of the first day for new reasons, and in obedience to a new Master. The revolution wrought in such an individual, is a sample of the power of truth and of the changes which christianity made upon whole communities at its first promulgation.

All histories declare, that the observance of the Lord's day has been continuous, from the morning of the resurrection down to the present day. All the *criteria* of infallible evidence, appear in this instance. The resurrection was witnessed by many, the commemorative institution takes place immediately, and has been perpetuated down to the present hour. The observance of the first day of the week, has been opposed because the seventh was enjoined in the Jewish ritual. But they who argue thus, are not thoroughly converted to Jesus Christ—they have not been divorced from the law—and seem not to regard the first day in the light of a commemorative institution at all. They seem to forget, or not to know, that the observance of days must be necessarily commemorative or prospective; for all time, abstract from this consideration, is alike holy and religious. They certainly must live in the smoke of the great city Babylon, who observe the seventh day in commemoration of the work of creation; rather than the *first day* of the week in commemoration of the resurrection of our Lord. But we must proceed to another evidence of the resurrection.

Before Jesus had ascended from Mount Olivet, he told them they were not to leave the city of Jerusalem in order to promulgate the resurrection, until they were clothed with new powers, every way

adequate to confirm their proclamation. "Tarry there (said he) until you be endued with power from on high." The commemorative day of Pentecost had fully arrived. In the metropolis, at this time, there were but one hundred and twenty disciples. They were all convened in one place on the morning of that memorable day; that day on which the first sheaf of wheat was to be waved in the air or carried over their heads, as a thank-offering for the new harvest. Mark the coincidence of time, and the accomplishment of the ancient symbol. On that day, the earnest of the harvest, he commences the new economy; that the converts of that day might indicate the immense ingathering of the nations to the fold of the Messiah. Now, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, that very day, in commemoration of the Savior's resurrection, as "the *first fruits* of them that slept," that first day of the week—while the whole nation was assembled to celebrate this great festival, and his disciples convened to commemorate his resurrection, behold the sound of a mighty rushing wind is heard, and all eyes and ears are turned to the place whence it proceeded. While they are flocking from all quarters to this place, in an instant many tongues of fire are seen encircling the persons of the apostles. These tongues of lambent flame, which covered the heads and faces of these apostles, were emblems of those *foreign tongues*, which, in a moment of time, they were able fluently to speak without ever having learned them. Not only the inhabitants of Jerusalem saw and heard the wonders of that day, but persons assembled at this great festival from all the Roman empire, heard and saw these tokens of the resurrection and ascension of the Lord. There were present, from Rome, Parthia, Media, Persia, Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia Minor, Phrygia, Egypt, Pamphylia, Crete, and all the African coasts of the Mediterranean. There were, of all languages and nations, auditors and spectators of this event. They heard the marvelous sound from heaven, and saw the tongues of fire. They, moreover, heard the Galileans, with their Galilean brogue, pronouncing all the languages of the world; speaking to every man, in his vernacular tongue; the wonderful works of God. Peter explained the matter to them all. He gave meaning and emphasis to the whole scene. "The oracle of your prophet Joel is this day fulfilled. Jesus has been received into the heavens. He promised us supernatural aid to attest his resurrection. He has now accomplished it. Let all the house of Israel know, assuredly, that God has made that Jesus whom you, with wicked hands, by the Roman soldiers, slew, the anointed Lord or King of the universe. He is now in heaven, placed upon that throne which governs all, and has received from his Father this gift, as a token of his love, and approbation of his wonderful works on earth, which he has now exhibited upon us in the midst of you."

In full conviction of all they saw and heard, as confirmatory of this proclamation, and deeply convicted of their guilt and danger, they exclaimed, "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" Seeing

them deeply *penitent* of their former course, Peter answers their question by announcing to them the gospel, or good news, which he was authorized now, for the first time, to proclaim to the nation. He makes his proclamation in language clear and forcible: "Reform (said he) and be immersed, or, as it is in *Greek*, be *baptized every one* of you in the name of the Lord Jesus, FOR THE REMISSION OF YOUR SINS; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit: for the promise you have heard from Joel is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call." They rejoiced that remission could be so easily received under the reign of the Messiah, and forthwith were baptized *for the remission of their sins*, and were filled with all joy, and peace, and good hope; so that they eat their food with gladness, and simplicity of heart, praising God. Now let me ask, what sort of vouchers are these to the truth of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus? Will the wonders of that day, witnessed by thousands of the most disinterested persons, nay, many of them embittered enemies to the truth of christianity; I say, will the testimony of *three thousand one hundred and twenty* persons, in attestation of a fact happening on the most public occasion, even on a national *anniversary*, in the metropolis, frequented and crowded with strangers from all nations under Heaven, be admitted in the courts of skeptics as good evidence!

I would now ask, what could be added to the cumulative evidences of the resurrection of Jesus? The uncontradicted fact that the accounts we now have of it were written at the times and places alleged; the number and character of the witnesses; the sensible and frequent interviews which they had with *him;* the length of time he conversed with *them;* his visible ascension into Heaven in the presence of all of them; the descent of the Holy Spirit, just now mentioned in attestation of his reception into Heaven; the appointment of one day in every week to commemorate it; the effects it produced at home and abroad; and the sufferings and reproaches attendant on the publication of it, which terminated only with the martyrdom of most of the original witnesses. I say, to all this, what could be added? And yet, when all this is said, but a feeble representation of the amount of evidence and documentary proof is presented.

We shall follow the witnesses a little farther. The Savior rose on the first day of the week. He showed himself alive, by many *infallible* proofs, during *forty days*. He appointed his disciples to meet with him on a specified day, on a mount which he had named. They did so. He gave them orders concerning their future course. They asked him a question concerning his kingdom, which he declined answering at that time. He forthwith ascended up, gradually receding from their sight, toward Heaven. They stood gazing after him, expecting him to descend; and might have stood there till the sun descended, had not two angels descended to console them, with

the tidings that he was gone to Heaven, never to return till he came to judge the world. They went to Jerusalem—waited for *ten days*. Pentecost arrived—the incidents of that day we have noticed. The facts of his resurrection and ascension were then fully proved, to the conviction of thousands in one day. But we must accompany them a little farther, and scrutinize their doctrine and their progress.

The next incident in Luke's history of the labors of some of the Apostles, presents another marvelous scene to our eyes. Peter and John are going up into the temple at three in the afternoon, when all the devout persons of Jerusalem assembled for prayer. A notable cripple, more than forty years old, well known to many of the citizens of Jerusalem, perhaps to all of them, because he was every day carried and laid upon a couch at the *beautiful gate* of the Temple, was in the act of asking alms from two of the Apostles, then ascending the stairs. Peter and John told him to look on them. He did so, expecting to receive alms. Peter said, Silver and gold I have none, but such as I have I give you — "In the *name of Jesus the Nazarene, rise up and walk*." He caught him by the hand. The cripple arose, stood, walked, leaped, shouted, and praised the Lord Messiah. The congregation arose, crowded out into Solomon's portico, which held many thousands. They looked with astonishment, first on the cripple, then on Peter and John. Peter opened his mouth to explain this fact to them. He declined all praise, as due to him, for this miracle of healing—the power passed through *the name* of Jesus. He then told them how they had treated Jesus in the presence of Pontius Pilate—how they renounced him and released a murderer. Then he asserts his resurrection, and claims merely the honor of being *a witness* of this fact. He explains how the cripple was cured; shows them their error; excuses their infidelity, as arising from a misapprehension of the prophets; appeals to their own prophets; shows that Moses had distinctly pointed the nation to Jesus of Nazareth. In conclusion, he informed them that God, having raised up his son from the dead, authorized them *first* to announce him to the seed of Abraham, with the assurance that God would yet bless and pardon them, every one of them, who turned from his iniquities. Here the number of the male disciples is augmented to five thousand.

They were interrupted, at this time, by the priests and the captain of the Temple guard. The Sadducees disliked this new way of proclaiming the resurrection of the dead in the person of Jesus, for it was irresistible, and like to demolish their whole sect. They imprisoned Peter and John. The next day the whole Sanhedrim in the city, many being present who had tried and condemned Jesus, assembled to try and interrogate these two witnesses of the resurrection. Peter, formerly a coward, and constitutionally a coward, rises above himself, and with the utmost courage and confidence, addresses them on the indictment in the following words: "Rulers

of the people and senators of Israel—if we are this day examined about the benefit conferred upon the cripple, by what means he has been cured, be it known to you, and to all the people of Israel, that BY THE NAME of Jesus of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God has raised from the dead—yes, by HIM, this man stands BEFORE YOU *sound*. This is *the stone* which was set at naught BY YOU BUILDERS, that is become the head of the corner. Neither is there ANY OTHER NAME UNDER HEAVEN among men in which *we can be saved*."

When they saw the boldness of Peter and John, perceived that they were *illiterate* men, and in *private stations* of life, they were astonished; and recollected that they had seen them in company with Jesus, about the time of his trial; and when they saw the cripple, standing sound and active before them, they were every man silent and confounded. After sending them out of the council chamber for a little, they consulted on the measures next to be pursued. That a signal miracle was done by these men, they said, THEY COULD NOT DENY, for it was manifest to all the citizens of Jerusalem; but to prevent its spreading farther, they agreed to severely *threaten* them to speak no more *in that name*. They did so. But Peter proposed them a question which they have not answered to this day: "Whether (said he) is it righteous, in the sight of God, to obey you rather than God? Decide this, if you please." They threatened them and dismissed them for because of the veneration of the people, and the publicity of the good deed *done in the name of Jesus*, they dare do no more than *threaten* them.

Thus they proceeded in Jerusalem. Multitudes flocked to the metropolis from the surrounding country and villages; and Peter became as famous for his miraculous powers in that city, as Jesus had been. They imprisoned him and some of his associates; but, the next morning, they found them in the Temple, declaring the resurrection and proclaiming reformation. The angel of the Lord discharged them from prison; and now the whole senate are alarmed, and begin to fear that the blood of Jesus would come upon them. "So mightily grew the word of the Lord and prevailed." They had Peter and his associates called before them again. They inquired, why they had disregarded their threats? Peter, in his christian boldness, replied to the charge OF HAVING FILLED JERUSALEM with their doctrine in defiance of those threats, in these words: "*It is necessary to obey God rather than you.*" This was his apology. But he must do more than apologize. He must attest the all-conquering fact. He adds: "The God of our fathers *has raised up Jesus* whom you slew, hanging him on a tree. HIM HAS GOD EXALTED *at his right hand*, to be a PRINCE and a SAVIOR, to give *reformation* to Israel and *forgiveness of sins*. And WE ARE WITNESSES of these things, and the Holy Spirit also, whom God has given to them WHO SUBMIT TO HIS GOVERNMENT. Had it not been for Gamaliel the *Pharisee*, who had some reason, as well as a strong prepossession in favor of *the resurrection of the dead*, they would have attempted their martyrdom.

They were released, and home they went "*rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer shame for his name.*"

So they progressed, till myriads of the Jews became *obedient to the faith.* Even many of the priests were baptized, and the crucified Jesus was *worshiped* by tens of thousands of those who had once considered him an impostor, or as a doubtful character. The Sanhedrim became more exasperated. The Sadducees are enraged. Stephen is murdered, INVOKING *the name of the Lord,* and attesting, with his last breath, THAT HE SAW JESUS *standing on the right hand of God.* Saul of Tarsus, who, at that time, consented to the death of Stephen, afterward converted, SAW JESUS and attested it with his blood. How increasing yet the evidence of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ!

Persecution dispersed the disciples from the metropolis—the congregation is broken up; all are dispersed through Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles. They continue where the persecution rages, most—and courageously hazard all *in attesting the resurrection.* The land of Judea falls before these dispersed proclaimers—and Samaria rejoices in the Lord. But to specify the conquests of this truth would be to narrate the whole Acts of the Apostles. Let the skeptics examine Luke's narrative through; his memoirs of Jesus Christ, and his Acts of Apostles; and then *reply.*

Were we to follow these Apostles to gentile cities, we should find them proclaiming the same facts, and we should see the same results attending. In the presence of magistrates, philosophers, and priests, they narrate the same facts, exhibit the same proofs—and all ranks and degrees submit to the government of the Messiah. The idols are hurled from their seats, the temples are deserted, and no price is offered for victims. Rome itself, is now convulsed, and the Galileans are likely to fill the imperial city with their doctrine. The Roman writers now, we may expect, will notice them, as soon as the gospel makes inroads upon *their superstitions.* Here then we shall close the testimony of the authors of the New Testament, and we will inquire what the Pagans have to say about these wonderful events.

But I must again remark, how much more attention is paid to the testimony of infidel Jews and Pagans, than to believing Jews and Pagans, by those who pretend to be so rational as to doubt the truth of christianity. How often have we heard such persons say, "Produce some *disinterested witness,* some Pagan, or some Jew, who was never converted to christianity, who will attest the gospel facts, and we will believe." We will believe an incredible witness, and reject the credible? We would believe Tacitus, but we will not believe Paul. Let Tacitus assert the resurrection of Jesus, and we will contend no longer. Well, now, suppose Tacitus had unequivocally said, *Jesus rose from the dead.* What would have been our logical conclusion? either that Tacitus was a christian or a hypocrite; and if either the one or the other, he would be unworthy of credit among

skeptics. For, if he were a christian, he would be as objectionable as Paul or Peter ; for these *rationalists* have no other objection to their testimony, than that it was *ex parte*, or because it was the testimony of friends. Now, if Tacitus had said that Jesus rose from the dead, and continued an idolater, he must have acted the part of a knave, or a hypocrite. He could not sincerely believe this fact and continue a worshiper of idols. His testimony in that case, would be worth nothing. It is much more forcible as it stands, for he goes just as far as he could go, to continue a Pagan, and be worthy of credit. The Rationalists would have us to produce an impossibility as glaring, as to place two substances in the same place at the same time. They would have us to produce an unbelieving Pagan, speaking and acting as, and being, in fact, a believing Pagan. They want a Jew or a Pagan who will speak like a christian, but who will not act like one. Now, as far as I can judge of testimony, I would incomparably prefer the testimony of the person whose life conforms to his testimony, to the testimony of the person whose life and whose testimony disagree. Now, if I found the words of Tacitus to differ from his character, I would not rely upon them as I do ; and taking into view the character of the man, I have no hesitation in saying, that his testimony is altogether credible and I am sure proves everything that we wish, and everything that an infidel can require.* We have already given his testimony.

The same may be said of other pagan authorities. Taking into view their times, circumstances, and general character, I presume they are all worthy and credible witnesses. Josephus too, excepting that *interpolation found in some copies*, is a good witness ; not respecting Jesus Christ, but many of the facts and circumstances recorded or alluded to in the historical books of the New Testament. But it is more to *shame* than to *convince* skeptics, that we trouble ourselves with the testimonies of either unbelieving Jews or Pagans. Those who will not believe such witnesses as sacrificed all temporal enjoyments, and laid down their lives in attesting the christian facts, who were above all temptation to deceive ; so numerous, so well attested by their cotemporaries, for all moral excellence, will never be convinced by the testimony of Pagans like themselves.

Perhaps I should place at the head of the list of Infidel, Pagan, and Jewish witnesses, the testimony of one Judas Iscariot, a traitor to Jesus Christ. The testimony of a traitor is sometimes more worthy of credit than the testimony of a friend. This Judas, as the case now stands, is a better testimony than a combined testimony of the eleven friends. Judas had long been a familiar acquaintance, and ranked among the most intimate friends of Jesus. He was enrolled among the twelve Apostles. He had been so impartially treated by

* I find that I had given these ideas in my speech, on Friday evening; having forgotten this circumstance, I made the same remarks on Saturday morning, and give them a second time, as I find them in the report.

Jesus, that, until the night he betrayed him, not one of the others could suspect that he would prove a traitor. Now, had there ever been the least reserve shown by Jesus to Judas, or had he been treated in any way less confidentially than any of the other Apostles, as soon as Jesus told them that one of them should betray him, all eyes would have turned to Judas. To him they would have all pointed. Instead of saying one by one, "*Lord, is it I?*" they would all have said within themselves, it is Judas. He had been, during the whole ministry of Jesus, most intimately acquainted with his speeches, and his actions. If anything *insincere, political*, or *contrary to the ostensible object* of the mission of Jesus, had ever transpired in secret, or if ever there had been any *conspiracy* among his followers, to delude or impose upon the nation, Judas must have known it. This must be conceded by all who have ever read the gospel histories.

Now that Judas was a designing, selfish, covetous, and insincere adherent to the party, must also be conceded. Seeing things going contrary to his calculations, that no immediate gain, honor, or advantage was likely soon to accrue—in an evil hour his passion for gain impelled him to seize the first opportunity of making as much as possible, by way of reprizals, for his disappointment in attaching himself to the retinue of Jesus. He therefore covenanted for *thirty* pieces of silver, the sum for which Joseph was sold into Egypt, to deliver into the custody of the Sanhedrim, the person of Jesus. He did so. Now had he been able to impeach Jesus of aught amiss in word or deed, it is evident he had the disposition and the opportunity; nay, to extenuate his own conduct even in the eyes of the chief priests and elders, it was necessary for him to make a disclosure; but he had nothing to disclose, save, after a little reflection, the agonies of his own mind. I have, said he, betrayed innocent blood. Heart rending thought! Here is the money: release him. If you have done so, we care not, said the priests, that is your concern, not ours. Now the import of the testimony of Judas is something like the following:

A. B. is accused of some base or unworthy action. Eleven of his intimate friends and acquaintances, all of good character too, are summoned to give testimony in favor of A. B. They all give him a good character and exculpate him from the charge. Their testimony, though not the same words, concurs in every grand point or fact. There is a twelfth person summoned, who is known to the court and jury to be at that instant a *bitter enemy* of the accused. He is interrogated, and deposes—"That he has been intimately acquainted with A. B. for years, and that never did he know him speak an unbecoming word, or commit an unworthy action, in any one instance, either bearing upon the accused or any other human being. Nay, so far from that, he has lived the most exemplary life, and his whole conduct has been nothing but a bright display of purity, piety, and benevolence; and, moreover, adds he, I do not think him capable

of an evil word or deed." Now such a testimony weighs as much, yes, weighs more with the jury, than the testimony of many friends, however unexceptionable their character. Now just such a witness was Judas. I have betrayed INNOCENT blood, said he; I have been instigated by the devil; my soul has no rest; and peace has departed from me. For so worthy a person as Jesus of Nazareth never lived: release him, or I die. He dies: and though a *felo de se*, he is a martyr to the truth of the pretensions and character of Jesus.

We shall now present to this audience a few extracts from the historians of those times, from the *edicts* of the Roman emperors, and other public documents:

"Josephus, the Jewish historian, was cotemporary with the apostles, having been born in the year 37. From his situation and habits, he had every access to know all that took place at the rise of the christian religion.

"Respecting the founder of this religion, Josephus has thought fit to be silent in his history. The present copies of his work contain one passage which speaks very respectfully of Jesus Christ, and ascribes to him the character of the Messiah. But as Josephus did not embrace christianity, and as this passage is not quoted or referred to until the beginning of the fourth century, it is, for these and other reasons, generally accounted spurious. It is, also, according to the manner of Josephus, in other parts of his history, to pass over in silence what appeared to make against his nation. When he wrote, the christian religion had made considerable progress, and everything respecting it must have been well known to him. He had, therefore, no middle way. It was necessary either to enter somewhat particularly into the subject, or to pass it over entirely. To have mentioned it, as is done in the passage in question, would have been to condemn himself. His testimony, then, to christianity, is found in his silence; and especially, as he was a priest, is abundantly strong. Not having embraced the christian religion, and, at the same time, being unable to contradict the facts on which it was founded, or to set them aside, he passes it quietly by. The minute description he has given of the other religious sects in Judea, fully proves that his silence was that of design, to which his circumstances compelled him.

"His account, however, of the civil and religious affairs of Judea, of the princes and rulers who governed the nation, of the situations of places, of the customs of the country, and of the manners of the people, is perfectly agreeable to the representation of these things which we have in the gospels. In addition to this, he has given a decided testimony to the appearance of John the Baptist, and also an account of his being put to death by Herod. The reason he assigns for his execution is different from that given by the sacred historian; but as to the fact, there is an entire coincidence between them. His words are, 'Some of the Jews thought Herod's army was destroyed of God, he being justly punished for the slaughter of John, who was surnamed

the Baptist. For Herod had put that good man to death, although he exhorted the Jews, after having exercised virtue and righteousness toward one another, and having performed the duties of piety toward God, to come to baptism. For thus baptism would be acceptable to him, not if they abstained from some sins only, but if, to purity of body, they joined a soul first cleansed by righteousness. But when many gathered round him, for they were much pleased with the hearing of such discourses, Herod, fearing lest the people, who were greatly under the influence of his persuasion, might be carried to some insurrection (for they seemed to do nothing but by his counsel), judged that it might be better to seize him before any insurrection was made, and to take him off, than, after affairs were disturbed, to repent of his negligence. Thus he, by the jealousy of Herod, being sent bound to Machærus, was there put to death; and the Jews thought, that on account of the punishment of this person, destruction had befallen the army, God being displeased with Herod.' In this passage, Josephus attests John's preaching and baptism, and the general attention which his ministry attracted, as well as his being put to death by Herod.

"Under the Roman government, it was customary for governors of provinces to send to the emperor an account of remarkable transactions in the places where they resided. Referring to this custom, Eusebius says — 'Our Savior's resurrection being much talked of throughout Palestine, Pilate informed the emperor of it, as likewise of his miracles, which he had heard of, and that, being raised up after he had been put to death, he was already believed by many to be a God.' These accounts were never made public, nor were any similar ones likely to be published, as such accounts were intended for only the information of government. Augustus forbade publishing the acts of the senate. But the above fact is attested by Justin Martyr in his first Apology, which, in the year 140, was presented to the Emperor Antoninus Pius and the senate of Rome. Having mentioned the crucifixion of Jesus, and some of the circumstances of it, he adds —'And that these things were so done, you may know from the acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate.' Tertullian, in his Apology, about the year 198, having spoken of our Savior's crucifixion and resurrection, his appearances to his disciples, and his ascension to heaven in the sight of the same disciples, who were ordained by him to preach the gospel over the world, goes on: 'Of all these things, relating to Christ, Pilate, in his conscience a christian, sent an account to Tiberius, then emperor.'

"In another part of the same Apology, he speaks to this purpose: 'There was an ancient decree that no one should be received for a deity, unless he was first approved of by the senate. Tiberius, in whose time the christian religion had its rise, having received from Palestine, in Syria, an account of such things as manifested our Savior's divinity, proposed to the senate, and giving his own vote as first in his favor, that he should be placed among the gods. The senate

refused, because he had himself declined that honor. Nevertheless, the Emperor persisted in his own opinion, and ordered, that if any accused the christians they should be punished.'

"These testimonies are taken from public apologies for the christian religion, presented, or proposed and recommended, to the Emperor and senate of Rome, or to magistrates of public authority and great distinction in the Roman empire.

"TACITUS, the Roman historian, was born in the year 61 or 62. He was Prætor of Rome under Domitian in 88, and Consul in the short reign of Nerva in 97. In giving an account of the great fire at Rome in the 10th of Nero, about thirty years after our Lord's ascension, he says: 'To suppress, therefore, this common rumor,' (viz: that the Emperor himself had set fire to the city), 'Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishments upon those people who were in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of christians. They had their denomination from Christus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was put to death as a criminal by the procurator, Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread not only over Judea, the source of this evil, but reached the city also, whither flow from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement. At first, they only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterward a vast multitude, discovered by them; all which were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city, as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; others, having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night time, and thus burnt to death. Nero made use of his own gardens as a theater upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer; at other times driving a chariot himself, till at length these men, though really criminal, and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated as people who were destroyed, not out of regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man.'

"Such is the testimony of Tacitus, who lived in the same age with the Apostles, to the principal facts which relate to the origin of the gospel, as well as to its rapid progress. He here attests that Jesus Christ was put to death as a malefactor, by Pontius Pilate, procurator under Tiberius; that, from Christ, the people called christians took their name; that this religion had its rise in Judea; that thence it was propagated into other parts of the world, as far as Rome, where christians were very numerous; and that they were reproached and hated, and underwent many and grievous sufferings.

"Suetonius, another eminent Roman historian, was born about the year 70. He says, in his history of the life of the Emperor Clau-

dius, who reigned from the year 41 to 54, that 'he banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Christus being their leader.' The first christians being of the Jewish nation, were for a while confounded with the rest of that people, and shared in the hardships that were imposed on them. This account, however, attests what is said in the Acts of the Apostles (xviii, 2), that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, when Aquila and Priscilla, two Jewish christians, were compelled to leave it. In the life of Nero, whose reign began in 54, and ended in 68, Suetonius says: 'The christians too were punished with death; a sort of people addicted to a new and mischievous superstition.'

"On the foregoing passage of Tacitus, and in reference to the persecution of the christians under Nero, Gibbon remarks: 'The most skeptical criticism is obliged to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus. The former is confirmed by the diligent and accurate Suetonius, who mentions the punishment which Nero inflicted on the christians.'

"In this persecution Paul is said to have been beheaded.

"The reign of the Emperor DOMITIAN, under whom the second persecution of the christians took place, began in the year 81, and terminated in the year 96. Domitian made inquiry after the posterity of David, and two men were brought before him of that family. 'At that time,' says Hegesippus, 'there were yet remaining of the kindred of Christ the grandsons of Jude, who was called his brother according to the flesh. These some accused as being of the race of David, and Evocatus brought them before Domitianus Cæsar; for he too was afraid of the coming of the Christ, as well as Herod.' Of these men Mr. Gibbon says: 'They frankly confessed their royal origin, and their near relation to the Messiah; but they disclaimed any temporal views, and professed that his kingdom, which they devoutly expected, was purely of a spiritual and angelic nature. When they were examined concerning their origin and occupation, they showed their hands, hardened with daily labor, and declared that they derived their whole subsistence from the cultivation of a farm near Cocaba, of the extent of about twenty-four English acres, and of the value of three hundred pounds sterling. The grandsons of St. Jude were dismissed with compassion and contempt.

"During the third persecution, which began in the year 100, in the third year of the Emperor TRAJAN, the younger Pliny was appointed proconsul of Bithynia, a province of the Roman empire, on the Euxine Sea. In that distant country there were now vast numbers of christians, against whom the proconsul, according to the Emperor's edict, used great severity. Being desirous of more full information how to proceed against the christians, and 'being moved,' as Eusebius says, 'at the multitude of those who were slain for the faith,' he wrote the following letter to Trajan, in the year 107, which was formerly noticed, and in the same year received the Emperor's rescript.

"Pliny, to the Emperor Trajan, wisheth health and happiness. It is my constant custom, sir, to refer myself to you, in all matters concerning which I have any doubt. For who can better direct me where I hesitate, or instruct me where I am ignorant? I have never been present at any trials of christians; so that I know not well what is the subject-matter of punishment or of inquiry, or what strictness ought to be used in either. Nor have I been little perplexed to determine whether any difference ought to be made upon account of age, or whether the young and tender, and full grown and robust, ought to be treated all alike; whether repentance should entitle to pardon, or whether all who have once been christians ought to be punished, though they are now no longer so; whether the name itself, although no crimes be detected, or crimes only belonging to the name, ought to be punished. Concerning all these things I am in doubt.

"In the meantime I have taken this course with all who have been brought before me, and have been accused as christians. I have put the question to them, whether they were christians? Upon their confessing to me that they were, I repeated the question a second and a third time, threatening also to punish them with death. Such as still persisted, I ordered away to be punished; for it was no doubt with me, whatever might be the nature of their opinion, that contumacy and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished. There were others of the same infatuation, whom, because they are Roman citizens, I have noted down to be sent to the city.

"In a short time, the crime spreading itself, even while under persecution, as usual in such cases, divers sorts of people came in my way. An information was presented to me, without mentioning the author, containing the names of many persons, who, upon examination, denied that they were christians, or had ever been so; who repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and with wine and frankincense made supplication to your image, which, for that purpose, I had caused to be brought and set before them, together with the statues of the deities. Moreover they reviled the name of Christ, none of which things, as is said, they who are really christians can by any means be compelled to do. These, therefore, I thought proper to discharge.

"Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves christians, and afterward denied it; the rest said they had been christians, but had left them some three years ago, some longer, and one or more above twenty years. They all worshiped your image, and the statues of the gods. These also reviled Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their fault or error lay in this: that they were wont to meet together, on a stated day, before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as God; and bind themselves, by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to

them, when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common, without any disorder; but this they had forborne since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies.

"After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid-servants, which were called ministers. But I have discovered nothing beside a bad and excessive superstition.

"Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared unto me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering; for many, of all ages, and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country. Nevertheless it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples, which were almost forsaken, begin to be more frequented. And the sacred solemnities, after a long intermission, are revived. Victims likewise are everywhere bought up, whereas for some time there were few purchasers; whence it is easy to imagine what numbers of men might be reclaimed, if pardon were granted to those who shall repent."

To the above letter the Emperor Trajan sent the following answer:

"*Trajan to Pliny wisheth health and happiness.*

"You have taken the right method, my Pliny, in your proceedings with those who have been brought before you as christians; for it is impossible to establish any rule that shall hold universally. They are not to be sought for. If any are brought before you, and are convicted, they ought to be punished. However, he that denies his being a christian, and makes it evident in fact, that is, by supplicating to our gods, though he be suspected to have been so formerly, let him be pardoned upon repentance. But in no case, of any crime whatever, may a bill of information be received, without being signed by him who presents it; for that would be a dangerous precedent, and unworthy of my government."

"In the above letters, we have a public and authentic attestation to the amazing growth of the christian religion, which had made such progress in the remote country of Bithynia, that the pagan temples were, according to Pliny, 'almost forsaken;' he also mentions that there had been christians in that country twenty years before. Their blameless lives, the purity of their religious worship, their obedience to their civil rulers, in giving up what they did not consider to be enjoined by divine authority, and their fortitude in suffering, and steady perseverance in the faith of Christ, are all unequivocally attested by their persecutors.

"The Emperor ADRIAN was born in the year 76. He reigned

twenty years from the death of Trajan, in 117. Trajan's edict being still in force against the christians, they suffered persecution under Adrian's reign, although he published no new edict against them. Upon occasion, however, of the apologies which Quadratus and Aristides presented to him at Athens in the year 126, that persecution was moderated. Of Aristides, Jerome says, 'he was a most eloquent Athenian philosopher, and in his former habit he presented to the Emperor Adrian, at the same time with Quadratus, a book containing an account of our sect, that is an apology for the christians, which is still extant, a monument with the learned of his ingenuity.' This apology is now lost. To Quadratus was ascribed the gift of prophesy, and he is said to have been 'a disciple of the Apostles.' The following is all that remains of the apology which he presented to Adrian. 'The works of our Savior were always conspicuous, for they were real, both they that were healed, and they that were raised from the dead; who were seen not only when they were healed or raised, but for a long time afterward; nor only while he dwelt on this earth, but also after his departure, and for a good while after it, insomuch that some of them have reached to our times.'

"We are informed by Eusebius, that 'Serenius Granianus, proconsul, wrote to the Emperor Adrian, that it seemed to him unjust that the christians should be put to death, only to gratify the clamors of the people, without trial.' The apologies of Aristides and Quadratus, presented about the same time with the above letter, appear to have contributed to procure the following favorable rescript from the Emperor Adrian. 'Adrian to Manucius Fundanus: I have received a letter written to me by the illustrious Serenius Granianus, whom you have succeeded. It seems then to me, that this is an affair which ought not to be passed over without being examined into, if it were only to prevent disturbance being given to people, and that you may not be left for informers to practice their wicked arts. If therefore, the people of the province will appear publicly, and in a legal way charge the christians, that they may answer for themselves in court, let them take that course, and not proceed by importunate demands and loud clamors only. For it is much the best method if any bring accusations, that you should take cognizance of them. If, then, any one shall accuse and make out anything contrary to the laws, do you determine according to the nature of the crime; but, by Hercules, if the charge be only a calumny, do you take care to punish the author of it with the severity it deserves.'

"In the above rescript, Trajan's edict is not repealed: according to which, if a man was accused and proved to be a christian, a President is required to punish him, unless he recant. But in a considerable degree, this rescript was favorable to the christians. And the persecution, which before had been violent, was now restrained and moderated.

"Beside the rescript, there is a letter of Adrian to Servianus, (husband of Paulina, the Emperor's sister), who was consul in the year 134. 'Adrian Augustus, to the consul Servianus, wisheth health. I have found Egypt, my dear Servianus, which you commend to me, all over fickle and inconstant, and continually shaken by the slightest reports of fame. The worshipers of Serapis are christians, and they are devoted to Serapis, who call themselves Christ's Bishops. There is no ruler of the Jewish Synagogue, no Samaritan, no presbyter of the christians, no mathematician, no soothsayer, no anointer, even the patriarch, if he should come to Egypt, would be required by some to worship Serapis, by others Christ. A seditious and turbulent sort of men. However, the city is rich and populous. Nor are any idle; some are employed in making glass, others paper, others in weaving linen. They have one God, him the christians, him the Jews, him all the gentile people worship.'

"It is not surprising that in the above letter the christians in Egypt, as to their worship, and in other respects, are confounded with the other Egyptians. But the inaccuracy of the representation in these things does not invalidate the general fact, which the Emperor here authenticates, that the christians, within a century after the resurrection of Jesus, were so numerous throughout Egypt.

"Antoninus, surnamed the Pious, succeeded Adrian in the year 130. To this Emperor Justin Martyr presented at Rome his first apology in the year 140. It is inscribed in this manner. 'To the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus, the Pious, and to his son Verissimus and Lucius, and the Senate, and all the people of the Romans, in behalf of men gathered out of all nations, who are unjustly hated and ill treated, I, Justin, son of Priscus, son of Bacchius, one of them of the city of Flavin Neapolis, in that part of Syria which is called Palestine, making this address and supplication.' The following are the concluding words of this apology: 'On the day called Sunday we all meet together; on which day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead; on the day before Sunday he was crucified; and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, he appeared to his Apostles and disciples, and taught them those things which we have set before you, and refer to your consideration. If these things appear agreeable to reason and truth, pay a regard to them; if they appear trifling, reject them as such; but do not treat as enemies, nor appoint capital punishment to those who have done no harm; for we foretell unto you that you will not escape the future judgment of God if you persist in unrighteousness: and we shall say, the will of the Lord be done.'

"The copy of an edict said to be presented to the states in Asia, in consequence of the above and other representations from christians, is still extant. It contains a strong testimony in favor of the christians; but as its genuineness is doubted by some, it is here

omitted, as well as everything among these early testimonies, of whose genuineness there is the smallest doubt.

"Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, succeeded Antoninus Pius as Emperor, in the year 161. There is still extant a book written by him called his 'Meditations.' In the eleventh book the following passage occurs, in which he mentions the christians. 'What a soul is that which is prepared, even now presently, if needful, to be separated from the body, whether it be to be extinguished, or to be dispersed, or to subsist still. But this readiness must proceed from a well weighed judgment, not from mere obstinacy like the christians. And it should be done considerately, and with gravity, without tragical exclamations, and so as to persuade another.'

"The foregoing passage contains an attestation to the fortitude of the christians who lived in the age next the Apostles, grounded on the assured conviction of the truth of that religion for which they suffered so much. The Emperor was a bigot in religion and in philosophy, and nothing but his prejudice against christianity can account for his condemning that fortitude which he ought to have approved.

"He ascribes the willingness of the christians to die to obstinacy, and says, that 'a man ought to resign life only upon a well-formed judgment, and considerately.' But did not the christians die in this manner? He says, 'it should be done with gravity, and without tragical exclamations,' upon which it has been observed, that 'it is not a little strange that a Stoic, whose writings are full of affectation, and are all over tragical, should blame the christians for not dying without tragical noise and exclamation. If they then called upon God and Christ, if they then exhorted their brethren to constancy and perseverance; if they expressed a contempt for this world and its fading enjoyments; if they spoke in sublime strains of the felicities of the world to come; in a word if they triumphed in death, as some of them did, there is nothing in it absurd or unreasonable, nothing but what is truly admirable. The heathen people around them wanted nothing to make them sensible of it but a better knowledge of the christian principles; such a persuasion of the boundless power and goodness of the One God, creator of all, and a well grounded expectation of eternal life.' It will be recollected, that the great persecution against the churches at Lyons and Vienne in France, some account of which has been given already, took place under this Emperor, who, therefore, ought not to have spoken in this manner of the sufferings of the christians.

"Marcus's expressions denote great uncertainty concerning a future state of existence. He is doubtful whether the soul, when separated from the body, shall be 'extinguished or dispersed, or shall still subsist.' He says again, 'to what purpose all this? . . . . You have made your voyage, and arrived at your port. Go ashore; if into another life, the gods are there; if into a state of insensibility,

you will be no longer distracted by pains and pleasures, nor be in subjection to this mean vessel.'"

Such was the amount of the speculations of heathen philosophers respecting a future state; yet, with but few exceptions, they went hand in hand in violently opposing that gospel which, presenting to all who will take the trouble to examine it, the most indubitable evidence of its divine original, has brought life and immortality to light.

To trace this chain of evidence any farther, would be superfluous. Nothing can be more fully authenticated than what has been brought forward on this head; all of which so forcibly reminds us of what Paul said before king Agrippa—"*this thing was not done in a corner.*"

From these documents, it is incontrovertibly evident that the establishment and progress of christianity was a matter of public and general notoriety; that it arrested the attention of all ranks and degrees of men, Jewish and Pagan; that all antiquity, Jewish and christian, admit the gospel facts, namely: that Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew; became the author of a new religion in Judea; was of the most obscure birth; was famous for supernatural power; was crucified in or near the metropolis, under Pontius Pilate, then procurator of Judea; that this suppressed the cause for a little time; that his resurrection, or some unexpected circumstance, caused it to revive and progress with uncontrollable power; that immense multitudes in Judea, and in all parts of the Roman empire, embraced it; that the christians were a virtuous, patient, and religious people, only censured for their inflexible adherence to the gospel facts, and unequivocal reprobation of idolatry, which the Romans called "*obstinacy;*" that they endured every kind of indignity, persecution, torture, and death, rather than to renounce their confidence in Jesus and their hopes of future happiness.

It is also unquestionably evident, that it spread with the utmost rapidity over all the Roman empire; and in about two centuries after the death of the Apostles, did, in despite of the power of circumstances, and Mr. Owen's whole theory, establish itself upon the ruins of all the superstitions of ancient Rome. In whatever light we view the conversation of Constantine, whether sincere or feigned—(the latter is the more probable)—it proves that christianity had won the day in leavening the minds of a majority of the millions composing this immense empire, before it had any favor shown it by the civil magistrates, or had a single legal provision in its favor. From the partial survey which we are now able to take of all the documents before us, with others of a kindred nature, it appears to me, at least, that he must believe a greater miracle than any which christianity exhibits, because altogether contrary to reason and experience, who can prevail on himself to think that christianity is either the offspring of fraud or fiction; or that it is not what it appears to be, a religion of supernatural and divine origin.

All sorts of witnesses attest the truth of the pretensions of Jesus Christ — friends, enemies, neutrals, Jews, christians, Pagans, believers, unbelievers, apostates. But still the pillars are the twelve Apostles. There is admirably worked up in their testimony, more of the constituents of *demonstration*, than are to be found in any testimony ever exhibited on earth. It is a species of testimony which, when well understood and carefully weighed, produces a certainty in the mind not inferior to the certainty derived from demonstration.

"It is a very singular circumstance," as one observes, "in this testimony, that it is such that no length of time can diminish. It is founded upon the universal principles of human nature, upon maxims which are the same in all ages, and operate with equal strength in all mankind, under all the varieties of temper and habit of constitution. So long as it shall be contrary to the first principles of the human mind to delight in falsehood for its own sake, so long as it shall be true that no man willingly propagates a lie to his own detriment, and to no purpose, so long it will be certain that the Apostles were serious and sincere in the assertion of our Lord's resurrection. So long as it shall be absurd to suppose that twelve men could be deceived in the person of a friend with whom they had lived three years, so long it will be certain that the Apostles were competent to judge of the truth and reality of the fact which they asserted. So long as it shall be in the nature of man, for his own interest and ease to be dearer than that of another to himself, so long it will be an absurdity to suppose that twelve men should persevere for years in the joint attestation of a lie, to the great detriment of every individual of the conspiracy, and without any joint or separate advantage; when any one of them had it in his power, by a discovery of the fraud, to advance his own fame and fortune, by the sacrifice of nothing more dear to himself than the reputation of the rest; and so long will it be incredible, that the story of our Lord's resurrection was a fiction, which the twelve men (to mention no greater number), with unparalleled fortitude, and with equal folly, conspired to support; so long, therefore, as the evangelical history shall be preserved, so long as the books are extant, so long the credibility of the Apostles' testimony will remain whole and unbroken."

But still we cannot dismiss this topic, until we glance at the other two commemorative institutions. For not only is there a *commemorative day*, but two *commemorative actions*, instituted to speak forth the certainty and importance of this event. These are the *Lord's Supper* and *Christian Immersion*, or as it is often called *Christian Baptism*. I place the Lord's Supper first; because first instituted, and because it commemorates an event prior to those which baptism chiefly contemplates. Before the Messiah was betrayed, on the night of the Passover, he institutes the *breaking* and *eating of a loaf*, and the drinking of a cup of wine, jointly among his disciples; as symbolically commemorative of the wounding or breaking of his body

even unto death, and the shedding of his blood as the seal of the love of God to man, a *sin-offering* or a *sacrifice for sin*, indicative of the *great pacification;* of *the reconciliation of a sinful world to the character and government of God.* This wonderful scheme or plan of things for the redemption of man, now consummated by the shedding of the blood of the Son of God, was to be adumbrated or portrayed in a solemn commemorative institution, from that moment till the end of time.—And so in all the public meetings of the christian communities on the commemorative day, this commemorative action, this christian festival, is to be, as it was from the beginning, observed. Not a single first day of the week has since transpired, not one week since the first constitution of the christian church, without the celebration of the Lord's supper. Till the days of Constantine, it was universal in every christian congregation on earth; and although some churches made the celebration of the Lord's death an annual or semi-annual thing, yet the Romanists themselves, and some of those called dissenters, have never permitted this observance.

The four grand criteria of Leslie, in all their force, apply to this institution—the death of Jesus was a public and sensible fact—exhibited in the face of open day, and before many witnesses—the supper instituted in anticipation of it, the night in which he was betrayed, has continued from that time till the present moment, now nearly eighteen hundred years, and in defiance of skepticism, will continue till Jesus comes to judge the world.

After the resurrection of Jesus, and before his ascension into Heaven, his last act is the institution of christian immersion *into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* He introduces this institution by avowing that "ALL AUTHORITY *in Heaven and earth* was delegated to him as the Son of Man." "Therefore," adds he, "go you, my Apostles, into all the world, and convert the nations, *baptizing* them *into* the name," etc. I would not be thought, my friends, to be influenced by any sectarian peculiarity in speaking of this institution. I trust I have given you evidence, at least, that I have no sectional, partisan, or sectarian feelings in this common cause. I am sorry that the naming of this Institution in English gives offense to some, I choose here to use the Greek word *baptizing* instead of the English word *immersing;* and I would not mention this institution at this time, if I could do justice to this cause without it. But we all agree, and know, and feel, that this commemorative institution is one of *the memorials*, yes, one of the most important *monumental actions* in the christian religion, and what is called the christian world. For while the Lord's day commemorates merely the *time* of the resurrection, while the Lord's supper commemorates merely the *death* of the Redeemer—this institution commemorates his *death, burial*, and *resurrection*—the former indirectly, the latter two, directly, symbolically and explicitly. All christians know that this was *the converting act*, or, to speak less offensively, it was the act enjoined in the commission for converting the nations of the world. Hence the very

place which it occupies, and the relation which it bears to the object and end of the mission, gives great emphasis to it. "Disciple the nations, baptizing them into the name, or convert the nations, baptizing," etc. The *active principle* shows its importance, as much as the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, "Except a man *be born of water*, and, *of the Spirit* he cannot enter my kingdom" (that was the kingdom which he was about to establish upon this earth).—But all christendom agree in this, that this is the *first action*, necessary to making or forming a disciple. Even some of our brethren are so impatient for its influences, that they carry their new-born infants to it. All this proves that all christendom now, as they did from the beginning, esteemed this as the first act, *formative* of a disciple of Christ; as far at least, as a profession, or public avowal of christianity, imports. And why has this been almost as universal as christianity itself? Because that it alludes to, and commemorates, the great facts—*the burial* and *resurrection* of Christ. Jesus died, was buried, and rose again. So we die unto all authority and hope, save that of our Lord Jesus the Messiah, and consequently unto sin in this act. We, as all *dead persons* are, are then buried with Christ for a short time; he for a short time in the earth, and we for a short time in the water. We also rise with him: he rose from the dead, and we rise from our death unto sin, to walk, and live, and rejoice in *a new life*. He died unto sin once; but rose released, or "*justified by the Spirit*," from all imputation; so we rise released from sin, pardoned, justified, believing in him as "having been delivered for our offenses, and raised for our justification." So admirably exact is this commemorative institution, which is now, and has been almost incessantly observed, since the ascension of Jesus into Heaven. From the day of Pentecost till now, not an hour, and for ages past, not a second has passed without the repetition of this commemorative institution, in some way or other. Till the council of Ravenna, till the reign of Queen Elizabeth in England, this ordinance was significant of the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. For every time that we see a person *buried* in the water and raised out of it, by the power of another, we see Jesus emblematically buried and raised again. And of the millions who profess christianity, every one (with the exception of a few Quakers, who understand not the use nor meaning of commemorative institutions), does *actively* or *passively* submit to this monumental action, and publish, without uttering a word, to every spectator, the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus.

What a wonderfully contrived institution this; which by *positive acts*, which no *à priori* principles, nor modes of reasoning could have suggested, keeps itself forever standing before the eyes of men. Christ crucified, pierced, wounded, dead, buried, quickened again, ascending, exhibited in all its sacred acts of worship. In our prayers, we speak to Him, in our praises we speak of Him, in our positive acts of worship, commemorate Him, and in our moral actions, imitate Him.

We now proceed to the next chapter of evidence which we proposed, viz:

PROPHESY.

Though both poetry and moral lessons extemporaneously expressed, have been called *prophesy* in an enlarged sense of the term; yet, in its restricted and most appropriate use and acceptation, the term denotes the foretelling of things future and unknown. It is, therefore, in this sense, the word is used in the following argument.

The foretelling of future events depends upon a knowledge of them; or of the causes and connections of things which, from established principles, necessarily issue in certain results. All men are possessed of a certain species of this sort of knowledge. They have a *data* which enables them not only to conjecture, but even to foreknow with certainty what shall come to pass. This data is either the result of experience, of reasoning upon well established principles, or upon testimony. We know that all the living shall die; that the trees will bud and blossom in spring; that the moon will change; a comet appear; or that an eclipse of the sun will happen on a certain day. Men of extraordinary sagacity can penetrate into futurity, and sometimes guess, conjecture, and even foretell, upon a large accumulation of probabilities, certain political events. But still the limitations and utmost bounds of this knowledge, are very narrow; and comparatively few are the events future of which any man can speak with certainty.

But although we admit that such foreknowledge is possessed by many, yet the foundation on which it rests, is not what the skeptical philosophers allow it to be. For if they were to be put to the test, they could not prove any topics or data within the area of the premises from which they reason, that the sun will rise to-morrow, or that laws of nature will continue to operate as they have done a single day. Let them, or let Mr. Owen, set about the proof of such a position. But that knowledge of future events which we call prophesy, or which is necessary to the foretelling of future events, is possessed by no mere man, and therefore no man, unaided by some supernatural knowledge, can foretell any future event, except such as we have already defined. For example, no man could have foretold, three hundred years ago—that in the island of Corsica, from a particular person there living, would arise in three centuries, a man of extraordinary military powers and political skill, who, by a succession of the most brilliant exploits and victories, should exile an old dynasty from France, raise himself to imperial dignity, affright the monarchs of Europe, and after having dazzled the world with his success, should by a more sudden descent and overthrow, die an exile in a remote island of the ocean. No man could have told, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, that in the colony of Virginia, from an old English family, there would, in less than two centuries, arise a man who should be the firm and undaunted asserter of his country's

rights—and by his council and heroic achievements, after a seven years' struggle, not only succeed in detaching thirteen colonies from the despotism of England, but in establishing a new world of republics, surpassing in the march of intellect, in advances toward national greatness, and in all the enjoyments of rational liberty, all nations upon the earth. No mere man could have foretold such events. Now, this is precisely the species of prophesy of which we are now to speak in this branch of the argument. Such prophets and such prophesies do the sacred oracles present. But before we open the sacred volume, it is necessary to premise still further.

It has been remarked that the existence of counterfeits and hypocrites, is a very stubborn and irrefragable proof that there is something genuine and authentic. No man is wont to pretend to anything which has not somewhere a real existence. At least, we have never met with such a case. All pretenses prove that something real exists. Now, among all nations there have been false prophets. The Pagans had their oracles, their auguries and their divinations. Modern idolaters have their diviners and necromancers. Jews and christians alone possessed, and gave the original of this idea. They alone afforded the *realities* of which these are the pretenses.

Great were the ends, and most important were the uses of prophesy, in the estimation of the author of the christian religion. It is interwoven through the whole web. Scarce a leaf is turned in the sacred volume without some prophetic annunciation. For giving to men just views of God's omniscience, of his interest in the human family, and of his government or Providence, and for inspiring them with the spirit of true devotion, the prophesies were promulged.

But all prophesies have one single end in view—Messiah and his kingdom. Whether individuals, cities, tribes, nations, empires, proximate or remote ages, are the burthen of the particular prophesies, Jesus, the Messiah, is the spirit and object of them all.

Had we time, and the audience patience, to go into a methodical detail of the evidences arising from prophesy, we should have taken the following course:

1. We should have examined the direct, literal, and express prophetic annunciations of the fates of the great empires and cities of antiquity. Among these the fates of Egypt, Tyre, Nineveh, Babylon and Jerusalem, would have merited particular attention.

2. The symbolic or figurative prospective institutions of the Jews' religion.

3. The allusive and picturesque representations of double reference, first to persons and events immediately pressing upon the attention of the speaker, but ultimately adumbrating and applying to the Messiah and his kingdom.

4. The direct, literal, and express predictions of the Messiah and his kingdom, found in the Jewish scriptures; and

5. In the fifth place, the literal and symbolic prophesies of the New

Testament, reaching down to our own times, and to the ultimate fates of all the nations now on earth.

Such would have been the outlines, were we to go into a general examination of this most inexhaustible source of evidence, argument, and proof of the authenticity of our religion.

Under the first head, we should have read the predictions of the fates of Egypt; particularly the 29th and 30th chapters of the prophesy of Ezekiel, delivered 589 years before the birth of the Messiah, and from the history of Rollin, and the modern history of Egypt, shown that these predictions, *literal* and *direct*, have been fully accomplished; that, from the most renowned and powerful of the kingdoms of the world, Egypt has become the "basest of kingdoms, and no more able to rule over the nations," according to the express declarations of the Jewish prophets. See Rollin, vol. 1, page 213, *et sequentes*.

We should then have laid the oracles concerning Tyre before you, as uttered by Ezekiel, xxviii, 1—21. This great city, who boasted in her strength, wealth, and beauty, and scoffed at Jerusalem, utterly perished, according to the oracle delivered 588 years before Christ. Rollin, vol. 2, pages 30—31.

Next, we should have called your attention to the predictions concerning Nineveh, as expressed by Nahum, ii, 8, and iii, 1—9, by Zephaniah, ii, 12—15. In these predictions, it was distinctly declared that the Lord would make Nineveh *a desolation and dry like a wilderness*. This oracle was delivered by Nahum, 710 years before the Messiah, and little more than 100 years afterward it was literally fulfilled. See also Rollin, vol 2, 43—44.

After this the fates of Babylon would have come in review; concerning this city we should have read, Isaiah xiii, 1—22. This prediction was delivered by Isaiah 739 years before Christ, and about 200 years before the destruction of Babylon. But on these fates of Babylon, we should have read Isaiah, xlv, 1; Jeremiah, l, 1, and then Rollin's description of its destruction, vol. 2, from page 102 to 116—Philadelphia ed., 1825. But these would require too much time. Concerning Jerusalem, we may yet be somewhat particular.

The predictions concerning the Jews, are so very minute, literal, and graphical, extending through the greatest lapse of time, and occupying the largest number of prophets, living through many centuries, that it is most astonishing that any rational being can examine these and the history of this people, and doubt the inspiration of these prophets. Even Moses, in the 32d chapter of Deuteronomy, gives the whole prospective history, reaching down to times yet unborn. We may, perhaps, call your attention to this prophesy. But at present we shall pass on, with one or two brief notices, to other matters of more direct bearing.

Jeremiah, xxxi, 32, expressly declares that the national constitution under which they then stood should be vacated, and a new one, of different provisions, instituted. But, in connection with this

explicit promise and prediction, the Lord declares that, Sooner will the sun, moon, and stars, cease to exist, than Israel cease to be a nation or people before him. Jeremiah, xxxi, 35, 36. His words are: "Thus says the Lord, who gives the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and stars for a light by night; if those ordinances depart from my presence, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me forever." Thus adds the Lord: "If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth can be searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel, for all that they have done, says the Lord." This prediction is now nearly 2500 years old; and the children of Israel remain, even in their dispersion, a separate and distinct people. They have not amalgamated with any nation, nor can they. 'Tis now nearly 4000 years since God made promises to Abraham concerning his seed, which have been accomplished, and are still accomplishing. They continue a separate and distinct people; and although the great and mighty empires of the Assyrians, Persians, Macedonians, and Romans, have wasted away, still the seed of Abraham remains a people.

That the Jewish scriptures, which contain these prophesies, read before the christian era as they now read, is susceptible of the fullest proof. The version made by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus was completed nearly 300 years before the birth of the Messiah; and thus the Greeks were in possession of these oracles, as well as the Jews. The version of the *seventy* Jews was read in all the synagogues of the Jews, where the Greek language was spoken; they were public property ages before Jesus Christ was born, John the Baptist, or any of the persons recorded in the New Testament history. No person could have any *motive* to interpolate them in favor of these persons. They wanted motive as well as *opportunity*. Admitting, then, that these oracles, read before the coming of the Messiah, only one hundred years before his birth, as they read now, no man can, with any pretension to rationality, resist the claims and pretensions of Jesus Christ. For he is as obviously the scope, drift, and termination of these prophesies, as ever did a conclusion flow from any premises. Now that these oracles were universally read by Jews and Greeks, as they now read, ages before the birth of Jesus, is as well established as any historic fact in the literature of the world. It was then read and known centuries before the birth of the Messiah, that God had said, that the sun, moon, and stars, would cease to shine in the heavens, sooner than this people cease to be a nation. No conquest nor dispersion, then, ever could annihilate their national peculiarities. They yet continue; and if there was not another prediction, this one alone is sufficient to convince them that are not so blind as not to see the force of reason, nor to judge of the weight of testimony, beyond all rational objection. It would appear that nothing is wanting to gather this people into their own land, but the destruction of the Ottoman empire. This the prophesies seem to indicate. They are ever

prepared to return, for they will not hold any real estate in any country in the world. Their expectation is to return, and who can say that the evidence in favor of such an event is at all doubtful, or the event itself improbable? "Blindness," says Paul, "has happened to them in part, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled;" then all Israel shall be saved, then the Jews shall be consolidated and become the light of the whole world. And so all Israel shall yet be saved. "For if the casting of them away has been the means of reconciling the nations to the love of God, what shall the restoration of Israel to the favor of God be, but, as it were, life from the dead!" Then shall the funeral song of infidelity be sung. The destruction of the Mahometan and anti-christian kingdoms, and the restoration of the seed of Abraham to the favor of God, are all that is necessary to the introduction of the Millennium. And that these events are upon the eve of being born, no man acquainted with the present history of the world, nor with the christian prophesies, can doubt.

But that many errors have been committed in certain interpretations of those oracles, we are willing to confess. But what sort of errors have they been? Errors arising from *dates* rather than from a mistake of the symbols; or from localities, rather than from a failure to understand the general drift of them. Prophesy is more like a blank map than a full history. The outlines of the countries and their relative situation, are accurately defined, but only a few of the principal places are named. It requires a very correct and minute knowledge of the countries, such only as travelers possess, to qualify a person to affix to every place its proper name. Now, in naming the places, there may many mistakes be committed by them who know and understand the outlines well. Such a knowledge of the prophesies all intelligent christians may acquire who study them; but few can, with perfect precision, fix all the dates and circumstances belonging to the accomplishment of many of these predictions. We must always consider prophesy rather in the light of a general chart delineating the outlines of a country, than as a topographical map fixing the locality of small places.

But I should have observed, ere now, that if we had intended a minute examination of all the grand items of prophetic importance, we would have paid some attention to the symbolic representations of the Jewish worship and history, as very exactly portraying the advent, mission, and work of the Messiah. This is a singular institution. That a people should be nearly 1500 years attending to a symbolic worship, not one of them clearly apprehending the import of it, in all its bearings; and that these symbols should, all at once, burst forth upon a nation like so many witnesses rising from the dead, is as stupendous a display of the Divine wisdom and goodness, as any other part of the whole economy. And such was the fact. A hundred incidents, never before understood, all coincide in their application to Jesus and his kingdom, and exactly concur in illus-

trating his person, mission, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, as so many commentators. It now appeared that not only the prophesies, but the *law* itself, was full of the Messiah, and a witness for him with a hundred tongues. But all the evidences arising from this species of prophesy, we must dispense with at this crisis.

In like manner, all those symbolic personages and typical occurrences which, though seeming to refer exclusively to persons and events of their own times, look forward. As the satirist, full of his object, glances at it in every person and incident he names, so these prophets, full of the spirit respecting the Messiah, glance at him through every person and event, as though he was the ultimate object continually in their eyes. I say, that this double entendre, or, as some improperly call them, double meanings, apparent in many persons and events, must be omitted at this time; and instead of dilating upon those symbolic personages, events, and institutions, we will fix our attention upon one vein of the prophetic mine, and work it with some degree of industry. And here, perhaps, we have raised too much expectation; for so ample are the direct and most explicit prophesies concerning the Messiah and his kingdom, that to set these in order, and pay a slight attention to each, would be more than our present strength, opportunity, and circumstances might permit. But without further preamble, we shall begin.

A brief notice of the direct, literal, and express predictions of the Messiah and his kingdom, found in the Jewish scriptures, is all that we shall now promise.

I ought, perhaps, to name seven of his most illustrious progenitors, who are signalized with oracles concerning him; all discriminating him, and turning the eyes of an expecting world toward his more immediate parentage, according to the flesh.

Shem, son of Noah, stands at the head of this list: "*Blessed be the Lord God of Shem.*" "God shall persuade Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of them, and Canaan shall be his servant." But soon the posterity of Shem branches out into numerous and powerful families, each of which founds an ancient nation. Another discrimination becomes necessary. Abraham is marked out, and the God of Shem becomes the God of Abraham. In the seed of Abraham the blessing is now promised. But Abraham has a son by Hagar, several sons by Kiturah, and one by Sarah; which of these shall be the honored progenitor? "*In Isaac shall thy seed be called,*" directs our eyes to this branch of Abraham's descendants. But Isaac has two sons, Jacob and Esau, which of these? "The elder shall serve the younger," gives the superiority to Jacob. Now Jacob has twelve sons, and which of these shall have the honor of giving a Savior to the world? "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from among his descendants till SHILOH come, and *to him shall nations come.*" But again, Judah becomes a numerous tribe, and still we desire another limitation. David,

then, the son of Jesse, becomes the King of Israel, and David's son is to become DAVID'S LORD; but David sings more than a hundred songs concerning him, which detail his history as if written after "*the root and offspring of David*" had finished all the wonders of redemption.

But the indices that point our way to the Messiah do not stop with David; they multiply as long as a prophet visits Israel: hence his mother is described as a VIRGIN by Isaiah—*a virgin of the family of David*. Singular prediction. Behold *the virgin* shall conceive and shall bring forth a son, and his name shall be IMMANUEL. The sneers and impious scoffs of skepties at the nativity of Jesus, had they noticed this oracle, would have been prevented or confounded. Let it then be noticed, that 700 years before this child was born, it was foretold that his mother should be a *virgin*.

But *the place* of his nativity is also clearly and expressly named. So clearly and unequivocally was the place of Messiah's birth ascertained in the Jewish scriptures, that all the priests and scribes in Jerusalem could tell Herod the place, without a difficulty. "And thou, Bethlehem, art not the least among the cantons of Judah; for out of thee shall come a *Governor*, that shall rule my people Israel."

But THE TIME of the birth and appearance of the Messiah was most exactly pointed out. And as this is a matter of great moment, I shall just notice the various descriptions of this time, found in the Jewish prophets. It was defined by several remarkable characters; the chief are:

1. He was to come before the second temple decayed, or was to appear in the second temple.

2. He was to come before Judah ceased to furnish a governor.

3. He was to come while the Roman emperors were in their glory.

4. And he was to come at the end of a definite number of years, from the permission given to rebuild the temple.

Concerning the first of these predictions, we have to remark that when the second temple was building, the old men who had seen the first are said to have wept when they saw the second edifice progressing, because it was so inferior to that which Solomon built; but, to console them, it is foretold that the glory of the latter house shall greatly excel that of the former. So speaks Haggai, chap. ii, 7. "I will shake all nations," says the Lord, "and the DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS shall come, and I will fill this house with glory." "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former." And why? Let Malachi declare: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom you seek *will suddenly come to* HIS TEMPLE, even the messenger of the covenant whom you delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts." So that it is clearly and expressly stated that the Lord would come while the second temple was yet standing. The first temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar on the tenth day of

August, 583 years before Jesus was born; and so the second was built about 500 years before the birth of the Messiah.

[Here Mr. C. moved to adjourn till half past two o'clock, P. M.]

Mr. *Campbell* continues: Mr. Chairman—When we adjourned, we were showing that the *time* of the coming of the Messiah was marked out and defined by a variety of characters that could not be mistaken.

The scepter was not to depart from Judah until *Shiloh* came. But it was merely lingering in that tribe for some years before the birth of the Messiah, for the land of Judea had become a Roman province, but still the remains of the ancient regal power had not been wrested from the hands of Judah. But so feebly did he grasp the scepter, that it seemed to fall at the crisis when the harbinger appeared.

The prophesy of Daniel, more circumstantially describes the time in the wonderful vision which he explained for Nebuchadnezzar. In this vision, there was a prospective view of the history of the world, from the time of the Chaldean or Assyrian monarchy down to the end of time. That this vision and prophesy might sufficiently attract the attention, and interest the feelings of all the world, it was vouchsafed to an Assyrian king, and explained by a Jewish prophet. The Jews and Gentiles are both concerned in it. Nebuchadnezzar had the vision, and Daniel interpreted it. Thus Babylon and Jerusalem attest its truth. In this vision, and the interpretation of it, the four great pagan empires are most accurately defined. The golden *head* of the image which the king saw was avowed by Daniel to be the Chaldean dynasty, the silver *shoulders* were the Medo-Persian dynasty, the brazen *body* the Macedonian empire, and the iron *legs* the Roman empire. These were the only *four* empires of the pagan world which attained to universal dominion; they all had it for a time; they were all pagan empires, and exactly delineated in this image. These great empires are represented in the interpretation as the only empires that should have universal dominion. The Assyrian began 2233 years before the birth of Christ, lasted 1400 years, and ended 770 years before Christ. The Persian empire began 538 years before Christ, continued 200 years, and fell 336 years before the christian era. The Macedonian or Grecian only continued ten years: it began 334 and ended 324 years before Christ. The Roman began 31 years before Christ, and after continuing 500 years, ended Anno Domini 476.

Now it was distinctly said, that in the days of the last empire, the God of heaven would set up a kingdom in the world, which should obtain the universal empire of the world, and that it would break and bruise to atoms every particle of the pagan governments; and most astonishing of all, it would begin without human aid, or it would resemble a stone cut out of a mountain without hands, which, self-propelled, should roll on, increase, smite this wonderful image of the pagan government, demolish it, and fill the whole earth.

Such was the imagery of the vision. And was not the Messiah born in the days of the Cæsars, who first formed and governed the *iron* empire?

Two incidents in this prophesy are worthy of notice. 1st. The time fixed for the commencement of this *new kingdom of God* in the world. And 2d. That the Roman empire once subdued, there should never again be a universal empire upon the earth, save that of the crucified King. Now we do know what efforts have been made to build up great empires, and how abortive they have all proved. The most successful effort ever made since the downfall of the Romans was that made by Napoleon. In the year 1813 he controlled the temporal destinies of sixty-four millions of human beings; but what was this number to the whole population of Europe, to say nothing of the other three quarters of the globe! Nothing like a universal empire has ever been established since the division of the Roman into ten comparatively petty sovereignties.

But Gabriel informs Daniel more definitely of the date of Messiah's birth, and of the commencement of the last great empire. He says, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin-offerings, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophesy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand that from the going forth of the decree to restore and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks. The street shall be built again, and the walls, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many, for a week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." When I have made another extract from Daniel we have all the data before us. Chapter viii, 13. The question there proposed is, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" "And he said to me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Now, as the Lord said to Ezekiel, "*I have appointed one day for a year*," and as we find in symbolic language one day stands for a year, we are at no loss in coming to the following conclusions:

From the time of the going forth of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem until the death of Messiah, would be threescore and nine and a half weeks; that is, a period of four hundred and eighty-five or eighty-six years. Seven weeks make forty-nine years—sixty-two

weeks make four hundred and thirty-four years—and in the middle of the week he was to establish the New Institution; that is three and a half or four years more. From the going forth of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem to the baptism of Jesus was four hundred and eighty-three years—his ministry was three and a half years, or the middle of one week; then he was cut off. And in half a week, that is, three and a half years more, christianity was sent to all nations. This completes the seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years of Daniel. Now, from the birth of Jesus till the general proclamation of the gospel, was about thirty-seven years—which, subtracted from four hundred and ninety, makes the nativity of Jesus four hundred and fifty-three years from the commencement of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, which occupied seven weeks, that is, forty-nine years. Daniel then fixes the time of the nativity; the commencement of the kingdom, or confirmation of the covenant; and the ultimate cleansing of the sanctuary, or purgation of the christian church from antichristian abominations. This last event was to be two thousand three hundred years from the aforesaid date. That is, from the birth of Jesus about eighteen hundred and forty-seven years. But all that lies before us now is the fact that Daniel gives the whole time intervening from the rebuilding of Jerusalem, after its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, till the birth of Jesus.

Now from these premises it is clearly established that the Messiah should be born while the second temple was standing; before the scepter and a lawgiver finally departed from Judah; in the reign of the Roman Cæsars; and four hundred and fifty-three years from the commencement of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. And does not the event exactly correspond with the predictions?

But so clearly was the event predicted, and so general was the knowledge of it, through the Septuagint version of the Jewish scriptures, then read through the Roman empire, that the expectation became general, that at this time some wonderful personage was to be born, who would put the world under a new government. This singular fact shows that the prophesies concerning the time in which the Messiah should be born were so plain in the estimation of all who read them, as to preclude all doubts as to the time of the appearance of the Messiah. But some will ask, Where is the proof of the fact that such an expectation was general? I answer, The history and poetry of Rome prove it. We shall summon some of their historians and the Mantuan bard, to give their evidence in the case.—

Suetonius, in the life of Vespasian—"Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore, Judea profecti rerum potirentur." An ancient and constant tradition has obtained throughout all the East, that in the *fates* it was decreed, that, about that time, "some who should come from Judea would obtain the dominion of the world."

Cornelius Tacitus speaks to the same effect when speaking of the prodigies which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. He says:

"Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judaæ rerum potirentur." That "many understood them as forerunners of that extraordinary person, whom the *ancient books* of the priests did foretell should come about that time from Judea and obtain dominion.

From the Jewish prophets, the pagan Sibyls gave out their oracles, so that the expectation was universal. The same year that Pompey took Jerusalem one of the sybil oracles made a great noise, "that Nature was about to bring forth a king to the Romans." Suetonius says this so terrified the Roman senate, that they made a decree that none born that year should be educated. And in his life of Augustus, he says, that "those whose wives were pregnant that year did each conceive great hopes, applying the prophesy to themselves." "Senatum exterritum censuisse, ne quis illo anno genitus, educaretur, eos qui gravidas uxores haberent, quod ad se quisque spem traheret curasse ne senatus consultum ad Ærarium deferretur."

Appian, Sallust, Plutarch, and Cicero, all say that this prophesy of the Sibyls stirred up Cornelius Lentulus to think that he was the man who should be king of the Romans. Some applied it to Cæsar. Cicero laughed at the application, and affirmed that this prophesy should not be applied to any one born in Rome.

Even *Virgil* the Poet, who wrote his fourth Eclogue about the time of Herod the Great, compliments the Consul Pollio with this prophesy. Supposing it might refer to his son Soloninus then born. Virgil substantially quotes and versifies the prophesies of Isaiah, and applies them to this child Soloninus:—

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminus ætas:
Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitor ordo.
Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto.
Tu modo nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum
Desinet, ac toto surget gens aurea mundo.

The last age, decreed by Fate, is come:
And a new frame of all things does begin.
A holy progeny from Heaven descends.
Auspicious be his birth! which puts an end
To the iron age! and from whence shall rise
A golden state far glorious through the earth!

Then the poet alludes to Isaiah lxv, 17. "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the Lion shall eat straw like the ox. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain:—"

———Nec magnos metuent armenta leones:
Occidet et serpens, et fallax herba veneni
Occidet.

Nor shall the flocks fierce lions fear,
Nor serpent shall be there, nor herb of poisonous juice.

Then the expiation of Daniel is referred to :—

> Te duce, si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostri,
> Irrita perpetua solvent formidine terras.
>
> By thee what footsteps of our sins remain,
> Are blotted out, and the whole world set free
> From her perpetual bondage and her fear.

The very words of Haggai last quoted are by the poet next referred to :—

> Aggredere, o magnos (aderit jam tempus) honores,
> Chara Deum soboles, magnum Jovis incrementum.
> Aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum,
> Terrasque, tractusque maris, cœlumque profundum :
> Aspice, venturo lætentur ut omnia sæclo.
>
> Enter on thy honors ! Now's the time,
> Offspring of God ! O thou great gift of Jove !
> Behold the world !—heaven, earth, and seas do shake !
> Behold how all rejoice to greet that glorious day !

Virgil, as if he were skilled in the Jewish scriptures, goes on to state that these glorious times should not immediately succeed the birth of that wonderful child :—

> Pauca tamen suberunt priscæ vestigia fraudis :
> ——Erunt etiam altera bella.
>
> Yet some remains shall still be left
> Of ancient fraud ; and wars shall still go on.

Now the question is not, whether Virgil applied this partly to Augustus, Pollio, or Soloninus then born ; but, whether he did not apply it to the general expectation, everywhere prevalent, that a wonderful person was to be born, and a new age to commence ?

The Jews have been so confounded with these prophesies and events, that such of them as did not believe, have degraded Daniel from the rank of a great prophet, to one of the inferior prophets ; and others have said that there were two Messiahs to come—one a suffering, and one a triumphant Messiah. But the excuses of mankind for their unbelief are so frivolous and irrational, that they deserve pity rather than argument. It is worthy of remark, however, that not only the Gentiles, the proselytes to the Jews' religion, the eastern magi ; but myriads of the Jews themselves recognized these evidences, and bowed to their authority.

But not only are the time and place of the birth of the Messiah pointed out in plain and direct predictions, but many of the prominent incidents in his life. I once attempted to enumerate the distinct and independent predictions concerning the Messiah and his kingdom, but after progressing beyond a hundred, I desisted from

the undertaking, perceiving, as is said by John, that the testimony concerning Jesus is the spirit of prophesy. I will just mention a few incidents in the prophetic communications concerning him. That he should go down into Egypt, and be called back to Nazareth; the appearance, spirit, and mission of John the Harbinger; the slaughter of the infants by the decree of Herod; his general character, meekness, mildness, and unostentatious appearance. "A bruised reed he was not to break; a smoking taper he was not to quench;" he was to use no sword, spear, scepter, nor torch, until he made his laws victorious. He was to make his most august entry into Jerusalem, mounted upon an ass; he was to be a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs; his zeal was to be so intense as to consume and waste his corporeal vigor; he was to be betrayed by a familiar friend; when delivered up, his friends were to forsake him; his condemnation was to be extorted in violation of law and precedent; he was to be sold for thirty pieces of silver; the money was to be appropriated to the purchase of the potter's field; he was to be scourged, smitten on the face, wounded in the hands and feet, laughed to scorn, presented with vinegar and gall; to be patient and silent under all these indignities and trials; he was to be crucified in company with malefactors; his garment was to be parted; and for his vesture they were to cast lots; his side was to be pierced, and yet not a bone was to be broken, and he was to be buried in the grave of a wealthy nobleman. All these, and many more incidents were spoken of, recorded, and anticipated from five hundred to a thousand years before he was born. And mark it well, the records which thus spoke of him were to be kept by the Jews and held sacred by the opponents of christianity. So that the documents could not be interpolated. So precise were the Jews in the copies of their scriptures, that as some of the Rabbins assert, all the words, and even letters used in their sacred books, were numbered.

I would here introduce a very rational argument, of the nature of mathematical demonstration, showing the utter impossibility of so many predicted incidents ever meeting in any individual by chance, guess, or conjecture; in any other way, in brief, than in consequence of divine prescience or arrangement. It is extracted from a very valuable work published by Gulian C. Verplanck, Esq., 1824, page 11—13.

"Rosseau, in the eloquent and paradoxical confession of faith which he puts in the mouth of his Savoyard Vicar in Emilius, has said that no fulfillment of prophesy could be of any weight with him to prove a divine interposition, unless it could be demonstrated that the agreement between the prophesy and the event could not possibly have been fortuitous. This proof is more than any fair objector has a right to claim, since it is moral probability and not strict demonstration which we must act upon in the most momentous concerns of life, and as reasonable men we should rest on the same evidences in matters of faith. In both the wise man will be

governed by common sense, applied to the investigation of rational probability.

"In this case, however, we may accept the challenge of the skeptic. Where the points of fulfillment of prediction are numerous, it may be literally 'demonstrated' that the probability of such accomplishment having occurred fortuitously is the most remote possible.

"This argument is put in a practical and striking point of view by Dr. Gregory, of the Military Academy at Warwick, well known for many respectable and useful works, especially on mathematics and scientific mechanics.

"'Suppose,' says he, 'that instead of the spirit of prophesy breathing more or less in every book of scripture, predicting events relative to a great variety of general topics, and delivering beside almost innumerable characteristics of the Messiah, all meeting in the person of Jesus, there had been only *ten* men in ancient times who pretended to be prophets, each of whom exhibited only *five* independent criteria as to place, government, concomitant events, doctrine taught, effects of doctrine, character, sufferings, or death—the meeting of all which in one person should prove the reality of their calling as prophets, and of his mission in the character they have assigned him. Suppose, moreover, that all events were left to *chance* merely, and we were to compute, from the principles employed by mathematicians in the investigations of such subjects, the probability of these fifty independent circumstances happening *at all*. Assume that there is, according to the technical phrase, *an equal chance* for the happening or the failure of any one of these specified particulars; then the probability against the occurrence of all the particulars in *any* way is that of the fiftieth power of two to unity; that is, the probability is greater than *eleven hundred and twenty-five millions of millions to one* that all of these circumstances do not turn up even at distinct periods. This computation, however, is independent of the consideration of *time*. Let it be recollected farther, that if any one of the specified circumstances happen, it may be the day after the delivery of the prophesy, or at any period from that time to the end of the world; this will so indefinitely augment the probability against the cotemporaneous occurrence of merely these *fifty* circumstances, that it surpasses the power of numbers to express correctly the immense improbability of its taking place.'

"It is hardly necessary to draw the inference, which Dr. Gregory goes on to establish, that all probability, and even possibility of accidental fulfillment, as well as of fraud, must be excluded. The sole reasonable solution of the question is, that these predictions and their fulfillments can only be ascribed to the intention of a being, whose knowledge can foresee future events, unconnected with each other, depending on various contingencies, and the will and acts of free agents; or whose power is so omnipotent as to bend to the accomplishment of his own purpose the passions of multitudes, the ambition of princes, the studies of the wise, the craft of the

wicked, the wars, the revolutions, and the varied destinies of nations."

I would here ask any rational skeptic how he will dispose of the argument? how can he remove this stumbling block out of the way of his infidelity? by what logic can he dispose of this document?

I will now introduce the skeptics to the character of the founder of the christian religion, as a logician, and give them a specimen of that ratiocination which he exhibited in pleading his cause with those who opposed his pretensions, in the metropolis of the Jewish nation. I will first read the passage as correctly rendered by Dr. George Campbell, of Aberdeen, for it is very much obscured in the common version. It reads thus, John's Testimony, chap. v, from verse 31 to 44.

"If I [alone] testify concerning myself, my testimony is not to be regarded; there is another who testifies concerning me; and I know that his testimony of me ought to be regarded. You yourselves sent to John, and he bore witness to the truth. As for me, I need no human testimony; I only urge this for your salvation. He was the lighted and shining lamp; and for a while you were glad to enjoy his light.

"But I have greater testimony than John's; for the works which the Father has empowered me to perform, the works themselves which I do, testify for me, that the Father has sent me.

"Nay, the Father who sent me, has himself attested me. Did you never hear his voice, or see his form? Or have you forgotten his declaration, that you believe not him whom he has commissioned?

"You search the scriptures, because you think to obtain, by them, eternal life. Now these also are witnesses for me, yet you will not come unto me that you may obtain life. I desire not honor from men, but I know that you are strangers to the love of God. I am come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me; if another come in his own name, you will receive him. How can you believe, while you court honor one from another, regardless of the honor which comes from God alone? Do not think that I am he who will accuse you to the Father. Your accuser is Moses, in whom you confide. For if you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote concerning me. But if you believe not his writings, how shall you believe my words?"

To the captious Jews he thus addresses himself:

1. "*If I alone bear testimony of myself, my testimony ought not to be regarded.*" This is disclaiming any special regard as due him, above others, on the mere ground of his own pretensions. It was equivalent to saying: No person pretending to honors and relations, a mission and office, such as I pretend, ought to be accredited and received upon his mere professions. No assertions, abstract from other documents in such a case, are worthy of credit. *Is not this reasonable?*

2. But, waving my own testimony, *there is another person whose testimony ought to be regarded.* But let us hear the reason why—some reason must be assigned, on account of which more credit is due to this testimony. The reason is: "*You yourselves sent to John.*" But in what does the cogency of this declaration consist? You Jews of this city, of your own accord, had formed such a high character of the integrity, capacity, and piety of John the Baptist, as to depute priests and Levites to him to know what his errand, mission, or testimony was. His character had convinced you of the reality of his pretensions, and he proved himself to your own satisfaction, as being far exalted above any earth-born motives of fraud or deceit. He was, yourselves being judges, a competent and credible witness. Now what did he testify? Did he not tell you that he was not the Messiah; that he was but his harbinger; and that his fame must decrease while mine must increase; that he was from below, but I was from above? Why then did you not believe such a credible witness? Or why receive one part of his testimony and reject the other? I *think*, then, said he, his testimony ought, in such circumstances, to be regarded. *Is not this also reasonable?*

3. But he proceeds: "*I need not human testimony. I only urge this for your salvation.*" I would convince you upon your own principles, and show that your rejection of me is without excuse. John, indeed, was a brilliant light, and for a time you considered him an oracle and rejoiced in his light. "*But the works that I do,*" are superior to any human testimony, and these "*show that the Father has sent me.*" To these I appeal—they are public, sensible, notorious, benevolent, supernatural. Could mortal man have performed them? Have not the laws of nature been suspended by my word? Have not the winds, waves, demons, and diseases of every name, acknowledged my power? To these works, only, as proof of my mission, I appeal. They prove not that I am the Son of God, the Messiah. They only prove that *the Father has sent me.* This is all I urge them for; but if they prove that the Father has sent me, then all my pretensions are credible; for the Father would not have sent a liar or deceiver, invested with such powers. Now I ask, *Is not all this reasonable and logical?*

4. But again, *The Father has himself attested me by his own voice:* and by a visible appearance—"DID YOU NOT HEAR HIS VOICE? *Did you not see his* FORM?" Were not some of you on the Jordan when he attested me when I came up out of the water? Was there not a voice then heard, saying, audibly, "*This is my beloved* SON *in whom I delight?*" You could not mistake the person of whom this was spoken; for over my head the heavens opened and you *saw* the Spirit in the *form* of a dove, coming down and lighting upon my head. You heard his voice then, and saw his manifestation. But you have *forgotten* this *declaration* concerning me! *Is not this rational and pointed?*

5. Once more—"*You do search the scriptures;*" and why do you

search them? Because you think them to contain a revelation from God; you think and acknowledge that eternal life is in them. This is all true; and in doing this, you act rationally, but why stop here? Now these very scriptures testify of me. To them I make my appeal. They all speak of me; and now show me the oracle, prophesy, or symbol in them, which respected him that was to come, which does not suit my character and pretensions, and I will find an excuse for you. Now I ask, *Is not this conclusive?*

If this be not argument and logic, I never heard any. So reasons the Savior. This grand climax of reason ends in the prophesies of the Old Testament. But it is not yet finished.

6. But adds he, *You* WILL NOT COME *to me.* It is not the want of light and evidence. You are now unable to reply. Yet you will not come to me that you might obtain that eternal life promised in the scriptures. I know you well. You have not a spark of the love of God in you. Had you loved God you would have come to me. Your hearts are full of the honors of this world—these you seek more than the honors which come from God only; yes, this is the secret. It is not argument nor proof, but *disposition* that you want. You pretend great veneration for Moses. But you do not really venerate him; you do not believe him, for he wrote of me. Now if you do not, with all your professed veneration for Moses, believe him, how will you, or can you believe me? If, prejudiced in his favor, you do not receive his testimony, how, prejudiced against me, will you receive mine?—But I tell you, however, I will not become your accuser. Your own Moses, in whom you trust, will one day convict you; for he said of me, that whosoever would not hearken to me, should be cut off from the congregation of God.

Such is a specimen of the topics from which, and of the manner how, the Savior argued his pretensions, and plead his cause with the people. A more cogent and unanswerable argument is not, if I am any judge, to be found among all the fine models of ancient and modern literature. And let it, I repeat, be borne in mind, that he makes his last appeal to the scriptures and to Moses. Prophesy, then, in his judgment, is among the highest species of evidence, and it is that which, as a standing miracle, he has made to speak for him in every age and to all people.

But I must notice, while on this topic, that Jesus pronounced prophesies himself, which, to that generation, and, indeed, to subsequent generations, speak as convincingly as Moses spoke to the Jews; and his predictions have produced, and do produce, upon the minds of a vast community, similar expectations to those produced among the Jews.

Hume says that "prophesy could not be a proof that the person who pretended to deliver oracles, spoke by inspiration; because the prophet is absent at the time of fulfillment; he is dead, and it could not prove to his cotemporaries that he was inspired." This would be true in one case, but in no other; when the prediction had respect

to events at a distance; but this is only sometimes the case: for most of the prophets foretold events soon to appear, as well as events to happen after long intervals. We shall find, if we examine the New Testament, that Jesus foretold many incidents immediately to happen, which required as perfect an insight into futurity as events at the distance of a thousand years. His telling Peter, that on casting a hook and line into the sea, he should draw out a fish with a *stater* in its mouth; or his telling his disciples, that, at a certain place, they should find an ass and his master so circumstanced, and that such events would happen on their application for him, required as exact and as perfect a prescience as could have, four thousand years ago, foretold this discussion between Mr. Owen and me. How many events of immediate occurrence did the Savior foretell, with this additional remark, "This I have told you before it happen; that when it happens you may believe." Prophesy, indeed, seems designed to *confirm* faith as the events occur, as well as to produce faith by contemplating those which have been fulfilled. But we shall find that, beside the predictions uttered by the Savior concerning his own demise, and all the circumstances attendant upon it, he foretold one event of such notoriety and importance as to confirm the faith of one generation and to produce faith in all subsequent generations. This I specify as one of great interest and notoriety. This was the destruction of Jerusalem, the temple, and the dispersion of the nation with all the tremendous adjuncts of this national catastrophe.

Upon one occasion, when the sun was beaming upon the beautiful gate of the temple, which radiated with all conceivable splendor, when that edifice stood in all the glistening beauties of the precious metals, costly stones, and the finest specimens of architecture, the Savior took occasion to tell its fate, and that of the people who frequented it, in such language as precluded the possibility of mistake in the interpretation. No prediction was more minute or more circumstantial than this one, and none could be more literal or direct. Both Matthew and Luke give us this prediction; the former in the 24th, and the latter in the 21st chapter of his testimony. The complete desolation of the temple to the foundation, to the removing of every stone, is foretold. The compassing of the city with armies, the slaughter of the inhabitants, and the captivity of those who escaped, are described. The fortunes of his disciples at this time, with all the terrors of the siege, and all the tremendous prodigies in the heavens and the earth accompanying these desolations, are named. And in the conclusion the audience is assured that all these things should happen before forty years—"before that generation should pass away." Now, this prophesy was written, published and read through Judea, and mentioned in the apostolic epistles for years before it happened; and a general expectation of this event pervaded the whole christian communities from Jerusalem to Rome, and, indeed, through all the Roman provinces. The allusions to these predictions are frequent in the apostolic writings. It was necessary

they should, for this reason ; the Jews, as long as they possessed the government of Judea, the temple, and the metropolis ; as long as they had any particle of influence at home or abroad, they used it with relentless cruelty against the christians. The Apostles had to succor the minds of their persecuted brethren, and exhort them to patience and perseverance by reminding them of the speedy dispersion of them among the nations. So that all the christians throughout the Roman empire looked for this catastrophe ; and so it came to pass that such of the christians as were in Jerusalem and Judea, about the time of the siege of Titus, fled according to the directions given by the Savior ; and thus not a believing Jew perished in the siege.

We lose many of the allusions to this event in the epistles, from our irrational modes of explanation, and neglect of the history of those times. Of these allusions the following specimens may suffice : To the church of Rome Paul says : "God will bruise *Satan*, or the adversary, under your feet soon"—not the Devil, as some ignorantly suppose. *Adversary*, in English, is *Satan* in Hebrew. "Get thee behind me *Satan*," is a terrible translation of the Savior's address to Peter. The synagogue of Satan was only a synagogue of unbelieving Jews *adverse* to christianity. "Brethren in Rome," says Paul, "God will soon put down the adversary of your religion, the Jews, who persecute you. Yes, their power to oppose you, will soon be past." This clearly alludes to the expectation founded upon the prediction before us.

Paul more plainly intimates the destruction of the Jewish power in his first letter to the Thessalonians, written eighteen years before the siege. "Brethren in Thessalonica, you have suffered from your gentile brethren such persecution as the congregations in Judea have suffered from their Jewish brethren, who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have greatly persecuted us, and do not please God, and are contrary to all men ; hindering us to speak to the gentiles that they might be saved ; so that they are always filling up the measure of their iniquities. But the WRATH OF GOD *is coming upon them at length.*"

Indeed, so frequent were the allusions to this prophesy, both in the public discourses and writings of the apostles, that their enemies began to mock them, and treat them as if they had been imposing upon the credulity of their cotemporaries. Hence, such allusions as these : "*Where is the promise of his coming ;* for, from the times the fathers have fallen asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation ?" Thus was Peter upbraided six years before the siege. The old Apostle, however, is not discouraged, being assured that he would make good his promise. "Yes," says he, "they think that we have too long talked of the coming of the Lord to avenge the iniquities of these people. They think that we mock your fears, and they say, 'The Lord long *delays* his coming to execute his vengeance upon this stubborn people.' But, my brethren, the Lord

does not delay in the manner some account delaying; but he exercises long-suffering toward us, that all might be brought to reformation."

In the letter to the Hebrews, written about six or seven years before the siege, Paul speaks to the persecuted Jewish brethren in the same style: "Yet a very little while, and he that is coming will come, and will not tarry." "Persevere, then, brethren, in doing the will of the Lord, that you may obtain the promised reward." James, too, in his letter of the same date, addresses both to the believing and unbelieving Jews on the impending vengeance. The wealthy and infidel Jew he commands to "weep because of the miseries coming upon them;" and the suffering christians he animates with the hope that "the coming of the Lord is nigh." Thus do all the Apostles speak of this event with the same certainty as if it had actually happened.

I need not detail the awful accomplishment of this prediction. Josephus has done this in awful colors. Tacitus, too, relates some of the circumstances. Every word of the prediction was exactly fulfilled, even to the plowing up of the foundations of the temple. It is remarkable that, on the tenth day of August, the very same day the temple and city were laid waste by the Babylonians, the temple was burned by Titus' army.*

I shall only give you another specimen of the prophetic spirit of the New Testament writers. Paul, in his letter to the Thessalonians, intimates that some persons had suggested that the end of the world was at hand. To counteract such an idea, which seemed to have influenced some to abandon the ordinary business of this life, he gives us a succinct view of the great series of events which were to come to pass before the end of the world. He describes a tremendous *apostasy*, in 2d Thessalonians, chap. ii, 1—10.

"Now we beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together around him; that you be not soon shaken from your purpose, nor troubled, neither by spirit nor by word, nor by letter from us, intimating that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any method; for that day shall not come, unless there come the apostasy first, and there be revealed that man of sin, that son of perdition; who opposes and exalts himself above every one who is called god, or an object of worship. So that he, in the temple of God, *as a god* sitteth openly

* I have read somewhere, that, before the temple was burned, Titus entered the temple, got out some of the sacred utensils, among which were the golden candlestick and the table of the show-bread. These he carried as trophies home to Rome; and on the triumphal arch which was raised for him in the city of Rome, this candlestick and table were carved upon it. This triumphant arch yet stands; and even yet the Jews who visit Rome will not pass under it. There is a sidewalk and a gate through which the Jews pass. So deeply rooted is the remembrance of this indignity upon their religion and nation, that eighteen centuries have not obliterated it!

showing himself that he is a god. Do you not remember, that when I was with you, I told you these things? And you know what now restrains him in order to his being revealed in his own season. For the secret of iniquity already inwardly works, only till he who now restrains be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed that lawless one; him the Lord will consume by the breath of his mouth, and will render ineffectual, by the brightness of his coming; of whom the coming is after the strong working of Satan, with all power and signs, and miracles of falsehood. And with all the deceit of unrighteousness, among them who perish, because they embraced not the love of the truth that they might be saved."

On this observe that the Apostle declares that, in the great drama of human existence, the end of the world could not come until after the apostasy. This apostasy he describes as beginning to work in the first age of christianity, but that it could not succeed in attaining its full vigor until pagan Rome should yield to christian Rome. Until he that sat upon the throne and supported the pagan superstition, should be supplanted and succeeded by a christian emperor, in plain English. Then, says he, will come forth that *lawless one*, who will usurp the honors of God alone, in his dominion over the faith and the consciences of men. I will be interrogated here by the short-sighted skeptics, how it came to pass that a scheme so benevolent as the christian scheme, if designed by a benevolent and wise being, could so far have missed its aim? How strange is it, say they, if christianity originated in divine benevolence, that there should be such a scene in the great drama as this long night of the apostasy and darkness! And I reply, how strange it is that this terraqueous globe, created by a wise and benevolent being, should be three-fourths covered with immense oceans; and the remaining one-fourth so large a portion of mountains and fens, deserts and morasses. One part of it parched with an arid sky; and another locked up in relentless ice! Short-sighted mortals that we are! and yet we will scan the universe! Could not the earth have been a thousand times more fruitful! nay, could it not have been a thousand times more comfortable to live in! Might we not have had loaves growing upon the trees, and wine in bottles hanging upon the vines, and thus have been exempted from so much labor, and toil, and care!! In this way we might object to everything in the universe.

I have, for years, contended that the handwriting of God can be proved. And can we not, even under oath, attest the handwriting of some men? Men have their peculiarities which will always designate them from the whole species. No two men write, speak, or walk alike. They are as distinct in each as in the features of their countenances, and the constitution of their minds. Each has an idiosyncracy of mind, an idiomatic style, as well as a peculiar chirography.

No man who has accurately analyzed the few general principles which govern the universe, and examined the poisons and sweets

which are strewed with so much liberality over the face of the globe ; who has explored the regularities and incongruities which appear above and beneath, can doubt that the mind which originated the harmonies, the beauties, the sweets and all the blessings of nature, originated also their contraries, and that it is the same wisdom and benevolence working in the natural and moral empires of the universe. They both exhibit the impress of the same hand.

We cannot give a fair view of the next item on the genius and spirit of christianity, unless we enlarge a little more upon this. We must glance at the design of the Jewish religion. In the logical arrangement of all subjects, much depends upon taking hold of a few general principles. Generalizing is not only the most improving exercise of the mind, but the best means of knowing things in the detail. This is that power which, in a great degree, distinguishes the vigorous and well-disciplined mind, from that of inferior caliber and cultivation. If it were possible to present a general synthetic view, without a previous analysis, we would prefer it ; for the only utility of analysis is to put us in possession of synthetic views.

There is an error into which we are all apt to fall, in attempting to scan the moral government of the world. We do not like to be kept in suspense. Rather than remain in suspense, we will be satisfied with very incorrect or partial views of things. There is nothing more uncomfortable than a state of suspense upon any subject which interests us. Our views are always partial at best, but much more so when we have not put ourselves to the trouble to analyze, with patience, the whole data presented.

When I hear persons caviling at the present state of things, and objecting to matters which they do not understand, I figure to myself a person stationed in a small room, say ten feet square, before which is passing continually a map ten thousand square miles in extent ; ten feet of which only, at a time, can be seen through an opening in one side. In this small room he sits and peruses this map, for seventy years. For many weeks at a time he sees nothing but immense oceans of water ; then apparently boundless forests ; then prodigious chains of mountains ; then deserts, flats, wastes, and wildernesses. Here and there a succession of beautiful country passes before his eyes. After contemplating this map for seventy years, he exclaims, What an irrational, ill-conducted, and incongruous looking thing is this ! I have seen forests, deserts, and oceans, interspersed here and there with some small specks of beautiful country. I must conclude that the Creator of this planet was either unwise or not benevolent. But, suppose, that on a sudden, the walls of his cottage fell down, and his vision was enlarged and strengthened so as to comprehend, in one glance, the whole sweep of ten thousand square miles ; what a wonderful revolution would he undergo ! Infinite wisdom and design now appear, where before he saw nothing but confusion and deformity. So it is with him who sits judging on the moral government of the world.

We have but a small part of the picture before us. Paul explains the whole of it. He teaches us that this world is, in the moral empire, what it is in the natural—a part of a great whole. When speaking of all the irregularities in human lot, and all the diversities in the divine government, in the different ages of the world, patriarchal, Jewish, and christian, he teaches us that the whole of this arrangement is subordinate to another state of things, having relation to the whole rational universe. All this is done, said he, that now unto the thrones, principalities, and powers, in the heavenly regions, might be exhibited, by the christian scheme, the manifold wisdom of God. There are various grades of intelligent beings, who, in their different capacities, and according to their different situations and relations, are contemplating this scene of things ; and from these volumes of human nature, the divine character is continually developing itself to their view.

Yes, my friends, your various lots, capacities, and opportunities, and your respective behavior, under these varieties, with the divine economy over you, are furnishing new essays to be read in other worlds. You are all but different letters ; some capital, some small letters, some mere abbreviations, commas, semicolons, colons, periods, notes of admiration, notes of interrogation, and dashes ; all making sense when wisely combined ; but when jumbled together, or separated, you are unintelligible and uninstructive to yourselves and all other intelligent beings. Angels read men, and by and by men will read angels, to learn the Deity. In the rational delights and entertainments of heaven you and they will read each other. Gabriel will tell you what were his emotions when first he saw the sun open his eyes and smile upon the new-born earth ; what he thought when he shut up Noah in the ark, and opened the windows of heaven and the fountains of the deep. Yes, Raphael will tell you with what astonishment he saw Eve put forth her hand to the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Gabriel will relate his joy when he saw the rainbow of peace span the vault of heaven in token of no more deluge. He will give you to know what were his emotions when sent to salute the mother of our Lord ; and all the multitude will rehearse the song they sung the night they visited the shepherds of Bethlehem. In turn, you will tell them your first thoughts of God and his love ; your own feelings as sinners ; the agonies of sorrow and grief which once you felt ; and how you met the king of terrors. Then will all the shades in the picture appear to proper advantage, and the seraphim and cherubim with their wings no more will hide their faces from man. All happiness, rational, human, or angelic happiness, springs from the knowledge of God. As it is now eternal life, so it will then be eternal happiness to know thee the only true God, and Jesus the Messiah, thy Apostle.

A vail is yet on the face of Moses, and, indeed, on the face of many of the conspicuous characters of antiquity, in the views of many of our sectarian dogmatists. Some think that Abraham, Isaac

and Jacob, were called, chosen, and elected, for their own sakes. They seem not yet to have learned this important lesson, that there never has as yet been one human being selected by the Almighty for his own sake. If it were necessary that the Messiah should enter our world, it was necessary that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, David, Daniel, and a thousand others, should have been selected from the family of man, and discriminated by the great King as they were. On this one principle the religions of the Jews and christians are altogether reconcilable. They mutually explain each other. They are but the portico and holy place, leading to the holiest of all.

The calling and congregating of the Jews were for the same intent, and is relative to the general good of all nations as was the calling of Abraham, or the first promise of a Redeemer to the human race. They must be put under a special arrangement for developing the divine character and government, and for giving us a few lessons upon human nature, which never could have been taught by any other means.

What does the Lord say concerning Pharoah? "I have raised thee up for this purpose, that in your history and my government over you, *my name* might be known through all the earth." The localities and symbols of the Jewish religion made it entirely subordinate to the christian; but the genius and spirit of the latter is universal, or adapted to the whole human family irrespective of all localities. But this only by the way. My remarks upon the *apostasy* gave rise to this disquisition, or rather an objection which we saw rising in the faces of some, constrained me to take this course, and to attempt to give some general hints, which, I trust, may repress that restive spirit of skepticism, which, like the demoniac among the tombs, is cutting itself to pieces, when pretending to forsake the haunts of the living for its own safety.

In one sentence, it appears to be a law of human nature that man can only be developed and brought into proper circumstances to please himself, by what we call *experience*. You may not be able to account for it, but so it is, that man must be taught by experience. I think we will all agree in this, that if Adam and Eve could have had, while in Eden, the experience which they obtained after their exile, and which the world now presents, they never could have been induced to taste the forbidden tree. Every revolution of the earth, and all the incidents recorded in human history, are but so many preparations for the introduction of that last and most perfect state of society on earth called the *Millennium*. First we have the germ, then the blade, then the stem, then the leaves, then the blossoms, and last of all, the fruit. Therefore, as Paul said, the apostasy came first.

The mystery of iniquity early began to work. She made mysteries of plain facts, that she might work out her own delusions. She, it was, that loved mysteries, that paralyzed the energies of the christian spirit, and inundated the world with all the superstitions, fables,

counterfeit gospels, and all the follies of Paganism in a new garb. These found many admirers among the doting philosophists of Asia; and thus, by degrees, the lights of Heaven were extinguished, or put under the bushel of these abominable, delusive mysteries, until a long, dark, and dreary night of superstition besotted the world. These dark ages have sent them down to our times, and bequeathed a legacy which has impoverished rather than enriched the legatees. That man does not breathe whose mind is purified from all the influences of the night of superstition, which has so long obscured the light of the Sun of Righteousness.

Great and noble efforts have been made; but they ended in speculations; and sects and parties, built upon metaphysical hair-splittings, have long been the order of the day. These speculations are turning gray with age; and a religion pure and social, springing from the meaning of gospel facts, will soon triumph on all the speculations of the day.

All the Bible critics, and even the commentators themselves agree, that Babylon must soon fall, like a mill-stone into the sea, never to emerge; and that her catastrophe will be succeeded by the millennial order of society. She shall be visited with the calamities of Egypt, Sodom, and Jerusalem combined; for she has combined within her dominions the enormities of the three; the filthiness of Sodom, the tyranny of Egypt, and the persecuting spirit of Jerusalem.

Had not this defection been clearly arraigned before me, and predicted by the Apostle Paul himself—had he not told us that under the form of godliness all the vices of the world would be arraigned; that "self-lovers, money-lovers, proud, defamers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, without natural affection, covenant, or bargain breakers, slanderers, incontinent, fierce persons, without any love to good men, betrayers, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power of it." I say, had he not taught us to expect such characters to creep into the church, I would have been prepared to join with Mr. Owen in opposing the religions of the world. But when I began to reason, I was taught to distinguish a thing from the abuse of it; and never to condemn anything until I was fully acquainted with it. I see that the *apostasy* which yet exists, is as clearly foretold as was the birth of Christ; and why should the accomplishment of one prediction confirm my faith, and the accomplishment of another weaken it!

But this defection is not only foretold literally, but symbolized by John in the *Apocalypse*, under such combinations, and under such figures as are well calculated to inspire us with a horrible idea of it. Do not be alarmed, my friends, at my naming the Apocalypse. This book is not so unintelligible as you have been taught to think. But I am not going into an analysis of it. I will only trace one

idea which runs through it, and then I will be done with the apostasy.

John, you remember, lived to be an old man; he survived the destruction of Jerusalem about thirty years. He saw antichrists beginning to show their faces, and was alarmed at the sight. He was exiled to Patmos for the testimony he gave of Jesus; and while there, viewing with anguish the apostasy beginning, it pleased the Lord, who had, while on the earth, honored this disciple with so many tokens of his love, to confer upon him another signal pledge. He cheered the heart of the old Apostle by promising him a view of the future fortunes of the church. After inditing seven letters to the seven congregations in Asia, he presents him with this astonishing vision: A window, as it were, is opened in heaven, and a scroll in the handwriting of an angel arrests his attention. This parchment, written within and without, and sealed with seven seals, is raised aloft in the hand of an angel; and a challenge is given to all the inhabitants of heaven, earth, and sea, to take and open the book. All was silent. John wept. Why did he weep? Because he knew the future fortunes of the church were written there, sealed up from all the living, and no one appeared able to open the seals and disclose the secrets. These he wished to know above everything in the world—therefore he wept bitterly.

At length the Lion of the tribe of Judah comes forward and takes the scroll, and prepares to open the seals. Universal joy is everywhere diffused, and John dries up his tears. The first seal is broken, and the scroll once unrolled; "Come *and see*," a mighty angel proclaims. John heard, looked, and beheld "a white horse and on him sat a king, wearing one crown, with a bow and a quiver full of arrows." He rides off. Instructive emblem of the Lord beginning to subdue the nations to the obedience of faith. I will not detain you with a notice of all the seals. They are all opened; seven trumpets are blown when the seventh seal is opened, and seven vials are poured out in judgments upon the inhabitants of the earth. The intermediate seals, trumpets, and vials, symbolize the events of one thousand two hundred and forty years; or more fully all the events since the pagan persecutions down to our own times.

But at the close of the different acts of this great *drama*, John sees the same person he formerly saw, mounted on a white horse, followed by all the armies of heaven, mounted on white horses; he had now upon his head *many crowns*, and he was clothed with a vesture *dyed with blood*, emblem of his conquests, and he had now, from the number of his conquests, obtained all the crowns of the kingdoms of the earth, and had a name written which no one understood but himself, and upon his vesture and on his thigh was written in brilliant capitals, "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS." So that the termination of the vision of the seals, trumpets, and vials, places the Lord Jesus before us as having subdued

all the nations of the world to the obedience of faith. This is the animating view which the Lord gave John, and through him has communicated to all nations of the earth, who consult these divine oracles. We rejoice to know that this period is nigh at hand, when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the whole earth as the waters cover the channel of the sea.

The world, I mean the christian communities, are tired of sectarianism; light is rapidly progressing; the true nature of the christian institution is beginning to be understood, and all the signs of the times indicate the approach, the near approach, of this happy era.

You have, my friends, in the preceding hints, a solution of all the difficulties which can be proposed upon the past or present order of society—an explanation of all the dark specks which appear upon the moral map of the world. My object was not to unfold the prophesies, but to give you a few hints upon the grand outlines, and to afford sufficient data evincive that the authors or writers of the New Testament were most certainly under the guidance of that omniscient one to whom the end of all things is as open and manifest as the beginning. To suppose that all these predictions found in both Testaments, first, concerning the fates of the mighty empires of the pagan world; next, concerning the character, coming, and kingdom of Jesus Christ; then, concerning the fates of his religion, and the fortunes of all the superstitions in the world; I say, to suppose that all these predictions are mere guesses or conjectures, or that they were written after the events transpired, or never written at all, by the persons whose names they bear, are suppositions, assertions, or what you please to call them, at war with all the literature of the world, with universal experience, with the common sense of mankind, and with the events which are now transpiring in the world. Such a supposition no rational mind can entertain; and we may say further, that neither Mr. Owen, nor any other person, will venture to examine or attempt to refute the argument derived from this source. It stands now, as it stood two thousand years ago, a document which defied criticism, which, with but half the light which New Testament prophesy has accumulated, convinced every man who had the patience and the honesty to examine it; and which, by the gradual and constant completion of the unfulfilled predictions, is designed one day to prostrate all the infidelity upon the face of the earth.

We promised you some remarks upon the genius and tendency of the christian religion, and also some strictures upon the social system. These will require another day. Indeed, my respected auditors, I have much reason to admire your patience and the deep interest you have taken in this discussion. It proves that you are alive to the great importance of the subject. The good order and decorum which have been exhibited by this assembly on this occasion, have never been surpassed, I presume, by any congregation on any

occasion. I am unwilling to trespass upon your patience, or farther to exhaust my own strength, already far spent; but when I reflect upon the immense importance of the subject, I should think that I was sinning against the best cause in the world, and was wanting in benevolence to my cotemporaries, were I not to attend to the subjects proposed. For although the evidence which has been deduced, from any one of the topics introduced, is sufficient to establish the truth of our religion to the honest inquirer, as we judge; and you must see, I think, by this time, that it is more than my friend Mr. Owen can refute; yet, being conscious that each argument in the series confirms all the rest, and that without the topics proposed the evidence would be incomplete, I must, therefore, my friends, beg your attendance another day. Not, indeed, for the sake of carrying a point, nor for the pride of victory; for well I know that the evidences of christianity have been triumphantly established long ago. It was my intention from the commencement, that all the documents relied on in conducting this controversy should go to the public in a permanent form: such also has been the intention of my opponent. We are constrained to think that he is actuated by a noble benevolence, though sadly mistaken in his views. But that our cotemporaries may have the advantage of all the lights that the present controversy can elicit from a new exhibition of a part of the magazine in the christian treasury, we wish to be favored with your attendance another day.

Mr. *Campbell* continues: Mr. Chairman—I have just now found on my desk a few questions from some unknown hand, which, I suppose, have been presented to me from my own invitations given during the discussion. As these questions bear upon our discussion, I beg leave to give a brief answer.

The first is, *Are the books composing the Old and New Testaments the only books of divine authority in the world?*

I answer positively, *Yes.* I have already said, that the books composing the two Testaments contain more than what is properly called a *Divine Revelation.* They contain much history which can with no propriety be called a Divine Revelation; for example, the history of the deluge—the confusion of human language—the dispersion of the human family—the biography of the patriarchs, judges, and kings of Israel—the chronicles of Judah and Israel. All the things recorded in these sections were known before written, and therefore could not be REVELATIONS. But it was necessary that these important facts, because of their intimate connection with the people to whom Divine Revelations were made, should be recorded and divinely authenticated. Hence the Pentateuch, in addition to all the revelations which it contains, presents us with a historic record of the first ages of the world, divinely authenticated.

The question concerning the *nature* of inspiration, whether (for instance) original ideas were *always* suggested to the writer, or whether the ideas sometimes communicated were only a mere re-

vivescence of former impressions, is one that has been ably discussed. However this question may be decided, it affects not the question before us. The Holy Spirit promised to the Apostles was to do one of two things: either to suggest things entirely new, or to bring all things to their remembrance which they had seen or heard. This was done. The writings of the Apostles and of the prophets are authentic histories, written under the guidance of the Spirit of God; or they are immediate and direct revelations of matters inaccessible to mortal man.

Query 2. *What credit is due to the books in the Old Testament, called the* APOCRYPHA?

Let it be observed that there were many other authentic and true narratives and documents among the Jews, as there are among the christians, beside the sacred writings of the prophets and Apostles. But it was not necessary to have under the divine patronage various histories by various authors upon the same subjects. It would have greatly increased the natural and necessary labors of life had all these records been preserved and collected into a set of volumes, and the reading of them all made necessary to understand either the scheme of divine government or of man's redemption. But to enable us to acquire all that is necessary to be known, certain books have been preserved by the divine authority. The *Apocrypha*—at least some books of it—contain a true history; but it does not claim to be a Divine Revelation. We receive the records of Philo and Josephus, and many of the primitive christian writers, as credible narratives of their own times; and, as far as they treat of times immediately subsequent to the apostolic age, they may be called the *Apocrypha* of the New Testament. All these writings may be, and most of them are, certainly credible and authentic works; but they constitute no part of either religion, and make no such claims upon us.

Query 3. *How are we to ascertain the authorship of Job, some parts of the book of Deuteronomy, such as the death and burial of Moses, the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews? etc.*

It is not necessary that we should be able to prove the authorship of every particular piece composing the Old and New Testaments to prove their *authenticity*.* The book of Job, for instance, has no

* Bishop Watson, in his Apology for the Bible, in reply to Thomas Paine, on the subject of these anonymous parts of the Old Testament, very pertinently remarks as follows, pp. 50, 51, 52:

"Having finished your objections to the genuineness of the books of Moses, you proceed to your remarks on the book of Joshua; and from its internal evidence you endeavor to prove that this book was not written by Joshua. What then? What is your conclusion? 'That it is anonymous, and without authority.' Stop a little; your conclusion is not connected with your premises; your friend Euclid would have been ashamed of it. 'Anonymous, and therefore without authority!' I have noticed this solecism before; but, as you frequently bring it forward—and, indeed, your book stands much in need of it—I will submit to your consideration another observation on the subject. The

name attached to it, nor circumstances mentioned in it, which could decide the author of it. Whether it was written by Ezra, Nehemiah, or any Jewish prophet, perhaps, could not now be decided. My belief in the authenticity and authority of this book, and all anonymous parts of the Old Testament, is founded upon the following basis. The Jewish scribes received them; the whole Jewish nation received them; their own internal evidence attests their pretensions; and, above all, they were quoted as genuine, and approbated as parts of the sacred records and revelation, by Jesus Christ, or his Apostles, concerning whose inspiration and certain knowledge of the character of these works we cannot entertain a rational doubt.

Concerning the question about the burial of Moses, and other such additions made to some books in the Old Testament, they proceed from inattention to the contents of the volume. Joshua wrote some additions to the books of Moses, called "*the Law of God;*" and that he, or Ezra, or some of the distinguished guardians of these sacred records, should have added the deaths or other posthumous circumstances belonging to the history of these great prophets, is inferable from this fact just now stated. Joshua says he wrote some additions to "*the Book of the Law of God,*" a name applied to the books of Moses. It is the style of Cæsar's commentaries, expressed in the third person: "So Joshua made a covenant with the people that day, and set them a statute and an ordinance in Shechem; and Joshua wrote these words in the *Book of the Law of God.*"

---

book called Fleta is anonymous; but it is not on that account without authority. Doomsday book is anonymous, and was written above seven hundred years ago; yet our courts of law do not hold it to be without authority as to the facts related in it. Yes, you will say, but this book has been preserved with singular care among the records of the nation. And who told you that the Jews had no records, or that they did not preserve them with singular care? Josephus says the contrary: and, in the Bible itself, an appeal is made to many books which have perished: such as the book of Jasher, the book of Nathan, of Abijah, of Iddo, of Jehu, of natural history by Solomon, of the acts of Manasseh, and others which might be mentioned. If any one having access to the journals of the Lords and Commons, to the books of the treasury, war office, privy council, and other public documents, should at this day write a history of the reigns of George the First and Second, and should publish it without his name, would any man, three or four hundreds or thousands of years hence, question the authority of that book, when he knew that the whole British nation had received it as an authentic book from the time of its first publication to the age in which he lived? This supposition is in point. The books of the Old Testament were composed from the records of the Jewish nation, and they have been received as true by that nation, from the time in which they were written to the present day. Dodsley's Annual Register is an anonymous book; we only know the name of its editor; the New Annual Register is an anonymous book; the Reviews are anonymous books; but do we, or will our posterity, esteem these books of no authority? On the contrary, they are admitted at present, and will be received in after ages as authoritative records of the civil, military, and literary history of England and of Europe. So little foundation is there for our being startled by your assertion, **'It is anonymous, and without authority.'"**

Respecting the letter to the Hebrews, although not having directly the authority of Paul's name, it proves itself to be his work. It contains certain direct allusions to Paul's labors, and he speaks of himself in such a style, and with such references to circumstances in which he was a party, as to render it certain that he is the writer. A person may introduce himself by a *periphrasis*, or circumlocution, without directly naming himself. Thus Paul introduces himself to the Hebrews to avoid encountering a prejudice existing against him in the minds of the unbelieving Jews, for whose benefit, as well as that of the believing Jews, he designed this letter.

Touching the authorship of these writings, although I think we have already sufficiently established this matter, I would remark, that, of the Apostles' letters, the *autographs* themselves, as well as many extrinsic circumstances, decided their pretensions. Paul's name, written by *his own hand*, after his amanuensis had written an epistle, was added to such of them as were not wholly written by himself. The congregations or individuals to whom they were addressed—some of whom were so addressed as to have provoked them to have rejected the letters if they had dared—were the best judges of the authenticity of these writings; and the fact of their having been received as such by these congregations, alone, had we no other proof, amounts to the whole evidence we have in proof of the authorship of the most popular works of Greece and Rome. If these writings had not been the productions of their reputed authors, or if such of them as are anonymous had not been known to have been the works of well attested authors by their cotemporaries, many would have been proud to have claimed them as their own. I do not know what human being would not have been proud to have been the author of the book of Job, or the letter to the Hebrews; and their being anonymous, yet received into the sacred writings, is as valid proof of their authenticity as if they had, like the greater part of both Testaments, been inscribed with the names of their authors.

Query 4. But we are also asked, *Are we sure that we have the genuine works of these authors? Are there no interpolations?*

When I hear of interpolations and contradictions, I think of the Honorable Soame Jenyns, once a skeptic. He had concluded to publish a work against the christian religion; but thinking that he ought to be well acquainted with its fables and absurdities before he ventured to appear before the public, he determined to make himself well acquainted with the contents of the book. But he soon found good reasons to reform his plan; and, instead of furnishing a work *against* the christian religion, he gave the world a short and unanswerable treatise upon the *truth* and *authenticity* of it. This treatise on the "*Internal Evidences*" is written in a masterly style, and with a boldness which nothing but the assurance of faith could inspire. He makes the following bold assertion which many would think is going too far:

"For I will venture to affirm, that if any one could prove, what is impossible to be proved, because it is not true, that there are errors in geography, chronology, and philosophy, in every page of the Bible; that the prophesies therein delivered, are all but fortunate guesses, or artful applications, and the miracles there recorded, no better than legendary tales; if any one could show that these books were never written by their pretended authors, but were posterior impositions on illiterate and credulous ages, all these wonderful discoveries would prove no more than this, that God, for reasons to us unknown, had thought proper to permit a revelation by him communicated to mankind, to be mixed with their ignorance, and corrupted by their frauds from its earliest infancy, in the same manner in which he has visibly permitted it to be mixed, and corrupted from that period to the present hour. If, in these books, a religion, superior to all human imagination, actually exists, it is of no consequence to the proof of its divine origin, by what means it was there introduced, or with what human errors and imperfections it is blended. A diamond, though found in a bed of mud, is still a diamond, nor can the dirt, which surrounds it, depreciate its value, or destroy its luster."

All the interpolations, and different readings, though numerous as *Michaelis*, a very learned German professor, makes them, counting all the minutiæ of letters and points, do not affect the character of a single fact recorded in the whole New Testament. Indeed, men have been so much more concerned about the *doctrines* than the *facts* of scripture, that they are much more alarmed about the omission, or change of a term, affecting some favorite conclusion to which they have come, than about the evidence on which the great salutary facts are established. Hence has arisen the great ado about interpolations. And if there were ever any interpolations designedly introduced, it was for carrying some doctrine or theorem, and not for proving a fact. Hence skeptics have nothing to fear from interpolations. But a notice of the dark ages here may not be out of place, especially as most of these different readings and interpolations occurred during this dreary period.

During this period, all learning was locked up in the dark cloisters and confined to the gloomy monasteries of papal superstition. The scriptures, before the art of printing, were in the hands of ignorant monks and nuns, who spent their lives in transcribing them. A majority of these copyists, did not understand the language in which they wrote them. We have seen some of these ancient manuscript copies. Large margins, for the purpose of notes and references were usually left on these manuscripts. It frequently happened that some of the copyists, unable to discriminate the marginal notes from the text, transcribed some of the explanations into the text. This occasioned various discrepancies between the copies. After the revival of literature and the Reformation, careful and exact comparisons of these copies were made, and the text was purged of most, if not all,

these interpolations. In these numerous and careful revisals and comparisons, not only of the copies, but of the most ancient manuscripts, and the quotations found in the works of the primitive fathers, almost everything of a doubtful character, even to the very expletives, were rejected. We have, most unquestionably, the most exact and faithful representation of the prototype of this volume that we have of any other book in the world. It would be impossible to interpolate the sacred text now, because of the rival sects. The same difficulty existed always, almost from the beginning; excepting that the invention of printing, and the multiplication of copies consequent thereupon, have imposed more insuperable barriers in the way of such liberties, than existed before. But when we take into view the VENERATION of even the most ignorant ages for these writings, and the tremendous awe inspired from the sanctions found at the close of the volume, together with sectarian jealousy, no work has been so much guarded against corruption. And a greater proof we cannot have of the truth of these remarks, than the fact that the church of Rome, in which most of the copies now extant were found, the corruptions of which are so clearly pointed out and condemned in the Epistles, have for ages transcribed the predictions, expositions, and censures pronounced upon herself, and handed to the Reformers the sacred text to condemn and expose her own abuses.

Query 5. — *How is it that St. Matthew says, in a certain place, It was prophesied by the prophet Jeremiah, and no such prophesy is found in Jeremiah, but in Zechariah?*

To this we reply that the divisions which now obtain in both the old Testament and the New, are of modern origin. Cardinal Cairo, in the twelfth century, divided the scriptures of the New Testament into chapters; and Robert Stephens, in the sixteenth century, divided them into verses. These distributions were made to facilitate references to these writings, but in thousands of instances they have obscured the sense of them.

The Jews divided all the writings of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, into fifty-four sections, for the purpose of reading them once in a year in their synagogues. Four of these sections were shorter than the others; and whether designed for two of their greatest solemnities, to be read together, two on each occasion, we cannot say; but so it was, that the whole volume was read once every year in their public meetings. But in quoting these writings, they sometimes quoted them under the general running title of these sections; or more loosely, under three heads—the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. At other times they were quoted with the most minute reference, as, for instance, "It is so written in the *second* Psalm." Sometimes the whole writings are called *the Law.* The Savior once quotes the Psalms thus: "It is written in the Law, *They hated me without a cause;*" yet this is found in the book of Psalms. The running title to the sections of the prophetic writings is said by some to have been *Jeremiah;* others have said that the Jews called Jeremiah *the weeping*

prophet, and used his name as an *appellative*, to denote all those predictions which had respect to the suffering of the Messiah. But one thing is obvious, that there was among all persons in that age a loose or general reference, as well as a strict and accurate reference to sayings in the prophets. If, then, Matthew did actually use the name of Jeremiah instead of the name of *Zechariah*, it may have proceeded from some of those causes assigned. But whether or not it affects no more the credibility of the testimony of Matthew concerning Jesus Christ, than the fact of Paul's forgetting how many he had baptized in Corinth, proves that he was not inspired with an infallible knowledge of the gospel.

Such objections as these exhibit a very strange state of mind, and show that the objector is entirely ignorant of the real grounds on which we assent to the divine authority of these records.

Having, then, very briefly attended to these questions, I proceed to the topic proposed on Saturday evening. To form correct ideas of the *genius* and tendency of christianity, we must pay some attention to the genius and design of the former dispensation. This we have already glanced at in our remarks upon *the apostasy*. Until the time of Abraham, all the nations upon the earth had the same general views of the Divinity that created all things and presided over the world. This will appear from all the ancient documents which penetrate into the most remote antiquity of the world.

In forming a correct view of the religious character of the ancient nations, it is necessary here to inquire how far the inhabitants of Persia, Assyria, Arabia, Canaan, and Egypt, were affected or influenced by the religious institutions of this period; for these were the first nations whose institutions gave a character to all the nations of the world.

Abraham was the son of Shem by Arphaxad. The Persians were the descendants of Shem by *Elam*. The common parentage of Abraham and the Persians laid a foundation for some similarity in their religion. Abraham's ancestors dwelt in Chaldea, and at the time that God signalized Abraham, the Chaldeans had begun to apostatize from the service of the true God. Hence the separation of Abraham from among them. But Dr. Hyde, and the most learned antiquarians, present documental proof that the Persians retained the true history of the creation, of the antediluvian age; and so attached were the Persians to the religion of Abraham, that the sacred book which contained their religion is called *Sohi Ibrahim*, *i. e.*, the Book of Abraham. For a considerable time after Abraham's day they worshiped the God of Shem, for they did not know all the special communications to Abraham.

The Arabians, down to the time of Jethro, retained the knowledge of the true God. How long after we are not informed, but their religious institutions, as far as we have account, differed little from those practiced by Abraham, with the exception of circumcision.

The Canaanites themselves, in Abraham's time, had not apostatized wholly from the religion of Shem. The king of Salem was priest of the Most High God; and during Abraham's sojourning among them, they treated him with all respect as the prophet of the true God.

Even among the Philistines at Gera, Abraham found a good and virtuous king favored with the admonitions of the Almighty. This he little expected, for he was so prejudiced against those people that, on entering their metropolis, he said, "Surely the fear of God is not in this place." But he was happily disappointed. For Abimelech, in his appeal to Heaven, says, "*Lord wilt thou slay a virtuous nation?*" And the Lord did not deny his plea, but heard and answered his request. There appears in the whole narrative no difference in the religious views or practice between Abraham and Abimelech, the king of the nation.

The Egyptians too, in the time of Abraham, were worshipers of the true God. In upper Egypt they refused, as Plutarch informs us, to pay any taxes for the support of the idolatrous worship; asserting that they owned no *mortal*, dead or alive, to be a God. The incorruptible and eternal God they called *Cneph*, who, they affirmed, had no beginning, and never should have an end. In the first advances to mythology in Egypt, they represented God by the figure of a *serpent*, with the head of a hawk in the middle of a circle. We find no misunderstandings nor difference between Pharaoh and Abraham, when the latter went down into Egypt. Indeed, with the exception of the Chaldeans, who were the oldest nation, and the first to introduce idol or image worship, we find a very general agreement in all the ancient nations respecting religious views and practice. And the first defection from the religion of Noah and Shem which we meet with in all antiquity, was that of the Chaldeans.

Now, to save the world from universal idolatry, Abraham is called; and in four centuries his posterity were erected into a nation for this primary object, to teach the unity, spirituality, and providence of God, as well as to introduce a new vocabulary by a symbolic worship, to prepare the world for understanding the Divine character and government preparatory to the mission of his Son.

Abraham was called at a time when idolatry began to appear in Chaldea, and when families began to have each a family god. When his descendants became numerous, and large enough to become a nation, and the nations had each its own god, it pleased the ruler of the universe to exhibit himself as the God of a nation. Hence originated the theocracy. Here it is necessary to suggest a few general principles of much importance in understanding the varieties which have appeared in the divine government. From the fall of man the governor of the world withdrew from all personal intimacies with the race. He no longer conversed with man, face to

face, as he was wont to do in Eden. The recollections of the Divinity became more and more faint as Adam advanced in years; and the traditionary information communicated to his descendants, became less vivid and impressive in every generation. All new communications from the Creator were through symbols, by messengers, or rather through things already known. *Things entirely unknown can only be communicated to the mind by things already known.* This axiom is at the basis of all revelations, and explains many otherwise inexplicable incidents in the divine communications to man. The natural symbols and the artificial names of things became, from a necessity of nature, the only means through which God could make himself known to man. This, too, has been the invariable rule and measure of all the discoveries which God has made of himself, his purposes and will. Hence the spangled heavens, all the elements of nature, the earth, and the sea, with all their inhabitants; the relations, customs, and usages existing among men, have all been so many types or letters in the great alphabet which constitutes the vocabulary of divine revelation to man. He has even personated himself by his own creatures, and spoken to man through human institutions. Hence he has been called a Sun, Light, Father, Husband, Man of War, General of Hosts, a Lord of Battles, King, Prince, Master, etc., etc. He has been spoken of as having eyes, ears, mouth, hands, feet, etc., etc. He has been represented as sitting, standing, walking, hasting, awaking. He has been compared to a unicorn, lion, rock, mountain, etc., etc. He has made himself known in his character, perfections, purposes, and will, by things already known to man. This is the grand secret which, when disclosed, removes many difficulties and objections, and sets in a clear light the genius of the Jewish age of the religious world.

Now when God became *the king of one nation*, it was only doing what, on a more extensive scale, and with more various and powerful effects, he had done in calling himself a *Father*. Both were designed to make himself known through human relations and institutions. One type, symbol, or name, is altogether incompetent to develop the wonderful and incomprehensible God. But his wisdom and goodness are most apparent in making himself known in those relations and to those extents which are best adapted to human wants and imperfections. And the perfection in these discoveries consists in their being exactly suited to the different ages of the world and stages of human improvement. At the time when he chose *one nation* and made himself known to all the earth as its King and God, no other name, type, or symbol was so well adapted to the benevolent purpose, as those selected. For when Israel was brought out of Egypt, all the nations had their gods; and these gods were esteemed and admired according to the strength, skill, prowess, and prosperity of the nation over which they were supposed to preside. Hence that god was the most adorable in human eyes, whose people were most conspicuous.

Wars and battles were the offspring of the spirit of those ages contemporaneous with the first five hundred years of the Jewish history, and with the ages immediately preceding. Hence the idea was, that the nation most powerful in war, had the greatest and most adorable god. Now as the *Most High* (a name borrowed from this very age) always took the world as it was in every period in which he chose to develop himself anew, or his purposes, he chose to appear as the *Lord of Hosts* or God of Armies. And to make his name known through all the earth, he took one nation under his auspices, and appeared as their Sovereign and the Commander-in-Chief of all their armies. Hence the splendid and easy-bought victories of the Israelites. One could chase a hundred, and ten put a thousand to flight. This explains the deliverance out of Egypt, and how the Lord permitted Pharaoh's heart to be hardened—for the purpose of *making his name known through all the earth*. Pharaoh and his court knew not the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and impiously asked, "Who is the Lord, that I should obey him?" But Moses made him know, and tremble, and bow. By the time when the Jews were settled in Canaan, the world was taught to fear the God of Israel, the Lord of Hosts; and so it came to pass that all the true and consistent knowledge of God upon earth, among all nations, was derived directly or indirectly from the Jewish people.

But we must not think that only one purpose was gained, or one object was exclusively in view in any of those great movements of the Governor of the World. This is contrary to the general analogy of the material and spiritual systems. By the annual and diurnal revolutions of the earth, although by the former the seasons of the year, and by the latter, day and night seem to be the chief objects, there are a thousand ends gained in conjunction with one principal one: so in this grand economy, many, very many illustrious ends were gained, beside the capital one just mentioned. For, as in the vegetable kingdom we have a succession of stages in the growth of plants; as in the animal kingdom we have a succession of stages in the growth of animals; so in the kingdom of God there is a similar progression of light, knowledge, life, and bliss. We have in the vegetable kingdom the period of germinating, the period of blossoming, and the period of ripening the fruit. So we have infancy, childhood, youth, and manhood, in our species. Each period calls for special influences and a peculiar treatment. So it is in the kingdom of God. It had its infancy, its childhood, and its manhood. In each stage it was diversely exhibited. The patriarchal, Jewish, and christian ages were adapted to these.

Again, we are not to consider the special temporal favors bestowed upon the Jews, as indicative that the divine benevolence was exclusively confined to one nation to the exclusion of all the earth beside. As well might we say that the husbandman who cultivates his garden despises or neglects his farm, or that he exclusively loved that part of the soil which he incloses with a peculiar fence. Other

circumstances and considerations require these specialties. The general good of the human race, and the blessings of all nations in a son of Abraham, were the ultimate and gracious ends in view in all these peculiar arrangements. This promise and guarantee were made to Abraham before the time of these ages or dispensations. So that the calling of the Jews and their erection into a nation under the special government of God, were but means necessary to that reign of favor under which we now live.

But some will still say, Why was not the Messiah born immediately after the fall, and why was not the christian era the only era of the world? Why did not the Universal Benevolence introduce the best possible order of things first? Such cavaliers remind me of the child who asks, whether from curiosity or petulance: Why does not the ripe ear of corn come up from the seed deposited in the earth? Why does not the full ripe ear first present itself to our eye? Would not a kind and benevolent being have done this rather than have kept us waiting for many months, for the tedious process of germinating, growing, shooting, blossoming? etc., etc. Could not an almighty, and benevolent being, have produced the ripe ear without waiting for a sprout, stalk, leaves, blossoms, and all the other preparations of nature to form an ear of corn? We are, even in the common concerns of life, but poor judges of propriety; and it is extreme arrogance for us to arraign Omniscience at the tribunal of our reason when we cannot tell the reason why the blossom precedes the fruit? Do we not see that it is the order of the universe, *natural* as well as moral, that there should be a gradual development? "*In the fullness of time*," when all things were fully ripe he sent forth his Son.

One part of the human family is cultivated like a garden, and another part is left like a wilderness, unfenced, and undressed. The vineyard, however, after a while produces, through an unavoidable degeneracy, no better grapes than the wild vines in the forest—and the hedge is torn down. A new order of things is developed, and the middle wall of partition crumbles to pieces. The Jew and Gentile are alike degenerated, and the new order proceeds upon a leveling principle. Now, no human being could have known that a government like the Theocracy, placing a people in such enviable circumstances as that system placed the seed of Abraham, would have secured so little to itself, and so little to the people under it, had not the experiment been made and continued as it was.

But all these matters will be much better understood when we contemplate the constitution of the Jewish nation. This constitution is, in one point of view, very pertinently called by the apostle Paul *The Letter*. No term could have been more appropriate to exhibit the views which Paul taught, than this term *letter*. The constitution under which this nation came into existence, as a nation, was written by the *Finger of God*, upon two tables of stone. But here let me explain myself. The instrument written upon these two tables is sometimes called the moral law of the whole universe; sometimes

the ten commandments; sometimes the old covenant, and the old testament. Now, the terms testament and covenant in the Scotch idiom, and in the English, are supposed equivalent to one and the same Greek word, *diatheke*. For the king's translators have many a time rendered this Greek word by both of these English nouns. The term *covenant*, in Scotland, has been applied not only to individual arguments, but to *national* compacts. *Institution*, or even *constitution*, in our day, much more correctly represents to us in our modes of thinking the true import of this term. The writing upon the two tables was in reality, in its original promulgation, and in the use made of it, precisely what we call a *constitution*. The nation received it as such, and the two tables on which it was written were called, "*the two tables of the covenant;*" and the chest or ark into which it was deposited was called "*the ark of the covenant.*" The whole covenant must have been on the two tables, else it must have been an imposition to call them *the two tables of the covenant;* and again, the whole covenant must have been in the ark or it would have been a deception to call that ark "*the ark of the covenant.*" I need scarcely add that the reason why the volumes called the *old testament*, containing the writings of Moses, the prophets, and the devotional pieces called the *Hagiographa*, is not because all these writings were the covenant or testament, or constitution of Israel, but by a figure of speech *the thing containing* is often called from the *thing contained*. Because these writings contain this covenant or constitution they are all called by the name of the old covenant, testament or constitution. In like manner we shall see that the New Testament has received its name from the same figure and example.

There were many other laws given to the Jews from the king beside this instrument, but these were not of the same high character with those thus written on the two tables. They were only "*leges sub graviori lege,*" *laws under a supreme law;* for the constitution of every country is the supreme law of the land. But the proof lies here: the Lord declared, If Israel would accede to the items to be proposed, they would, in consequence, become a peculiar nation, a new sort of kingdom; a community exalted above all the national communities upon earth. They agreed to these preliminaries. Then the Lord said, in their hearing: "*I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage;* therefore ye shall," etc. Such was the agreement, and such were the items afterward called, *the covenant* or constitution.

This constitution continued in one sense for about fifteen hundred years. It could not be broken, or made of none effect, by the transgression of a few individuals. But as soon as the great majority of the people departed from it, God ceased to reign over them as he had done. He allowed his enemies to make prisoners of them; to invade and devastate their land, and carry them into bondage again. Now, so long as this people lived up to the *letter* of this instrument, so long they were under the especial government of God; and under

all the miraculous displays which we see distinguished their history from their eduction from Egypt till they were carried into Babylon by the Assyrian monarch. This explains the reason why miracles continued in Israel so long—and why they ceased at the period alluded to. Miracles were the order of the day for many hundred years in all the important epochs of their history. But after the captivity, the special providences ceased.

Now, let us hear Jeremiah, who lived about these times, speak of this covenant and the intentions of the Lord concerning them.—Jer. xxxi, 31, 32, 33, 34.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day *that* I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt (which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband to them, saith the Lord); but this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying: Know the Lord; for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sins no more."

Jeremiah then predicts a time when this constitution would cease to be the constitution of Israel—and a new one of a different character introduced. We do not, as some might think, speak of the abrogation or disannulling of anything *moral*. The laws of morality, like those of nature, are immutable; but the particular forms, and arrangements, and modification of these principles should be changed, and the whole inscribed, not upon stone, but upon the hearts of men. Now here is the essential difference between the *old* and the *new* constitution. The former was not written upon the heart, the latter is. The former was pure *letter*, the latter is pure *spirit*. The first, pointed out to the eye, to the *intellect* of man, a rule of life; the latter, infuses it into the soul or gives a disposition and bias to these principles of action: nay, it imparts to the heart the principle which the letter or law only laid before the eyes. I develop the matter no farther here. I only prepare the way for this sweeping distinction that the Jewish covenant or institution was a covenant or *constitution of the letter or law*. In one sentence, the first was a *constitution of law:* the second, or christian, is a *constitution of favor*.

Let us hear Paul elaborate this matter, 2 Cor. iii, 6—18.

"Who indeed hath fitted us to be ministers of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit: now the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive. Beside, if the ministry of death, imprinted on stones with letters, was done with glory, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly on the face of Moses, because of the glory of his face which was to be abolished; how shall not the min-

istry of the spirit rather be with glory? And, if the ministry of condemnation was honor, much more doth the ministry of righteousness abound in honor. And therefore, that which was glorified, was not glorified in this respect, by reason of the excelling glory. Beside, if that which is abolished, is abolished by glory, much more that which remaineth, remaineth in glory. Wherefore, having such a persuasion, we use much plainness of speech; and not as Moses, who put a vail upon his face, that the children of Israel might not steadfastly look to the end of the thing to be abolished. Now their minds were blinded; for until this day, the same vail remaineth in the reading of the Old Covenant, it not being revealed, that it is abolished by Christ. Moreover, until this day, when Moses is read, the vail lieth upon the heart. But, when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken from around it. Now the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. For we all, with an unvailed face reflecting as mirrors the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as from the Lord of the spirit."

Here is the contrast—letter and spirit. "The letter kills—the spirit gives life. Ministration of death—ministration of spirit, that which is done away, and that which remains."—Glorious the former in its promulgation, more glorious the latter in its introduction;—tending of the one is to bondage, of the other to liberty. All human privileges are *constitutional*. Therefore as in the constitution, so are the privileges of the people whose it is.

But here we must observe that there is some reason in Mr. Owen's remark, that men are not to be made happy by letter or law. Written codes of laws, however good, are not adapted to augment human happiness, much less to produce it. Laws are restraints—the more numerous, the more are the restraints; to restrain a person is to diminish his enjoyments. It is therefore much more conducive to human happiness to remove the cause which makes these restraints necessary. To infuse into the mind such principles as will make men happy is infinitely more rational than by good laws to curb evil principles already implanted. To remove the disposition to steal, is much more rational than to promulge laws against theft. That system then is incomparably the most conducive to morality, good order, and happiness, and is, therefore, by far the most rational, which removes the evil principle, rather than attempts to curb it by legal restraints. The law was not made for good men. In any state of society the only happiness that good men derive from law is protection. In no other way can it conduce to their happiness. It is made for evil doers.

So far, then, Mr. Owen is right; but had he known what follows, he never would have adopted so ineffectual a scheme as that which he has proposed. The Almighty gave us an excellent specimen of what a good law could do; he made the experiment for us in the history of the Jews. He gave them the best constitution, the finest

country, and a well arranged society—a very *social system.* The twelve tribes were twelve communities. They supplied themselves and created a large surplus; so that for two years, at least, in every seven, they rested, and their land rested one. They were under the best government, and enjoyed the greatest share of social privileges ever enjoyed by any people; yet they became worse and worse.

Now he found fault with the whole economy, and introduced a new one upon quite different principles. Instead of circumcising the flesh, he circumcised the heart; and instead of giving a code of laws to govern men's outward actions, he gives them new hearts; or, in other words, by a constitution of pure favor, or grace, he implants noble principles, so efficient, as neither confiscation of goods, imprisonment, nor death itself, could induce them to do a mean action. I admit that since men have corrupted christianity by converting it into a new code of laws, observances, and ceremonies, it has not been so productive of those happy influences as it once was almost universally; yet still its direct influences upon all who believe and understand it, are equal to what they ever were; and its indirect influences upon society at large, have civilized and moralized it to an extent far beyond any system ever exhibited on earth.

But what I now contend for is, that pure christianity is founded upon the most philosophic view of human nature. It aims not at reforming or happifying the world by a system of legal restraints, however excellent; but its immediate object is to implant in the human heart, through a discovery of the divine philanthropy, a principle of love, which fulfills every moral precept ever promulgated on earth. Here is the grand secret: the religion of Jesus Christ melts the hearts of men into pure philanthropy. It converts a lion into a lamb. It has done this in our times in countless instances. Mr. Owen only dreams of reformations. Christianity alone changes, regenerates and reforms wicked men. The materialists declare their system "*cannot make a wicked man good.*" Skepticism never converted a wicked man since the days of Celsus till now. Mr. Owen cannot produce one instance. But christianity, taking hold of the heart of man, not by law, but by love; not by letter, but by favor, has converted millions of the worst characters into the very best. Yes, the religion of Jesus sheds abroad in the human heart the love of God; and that love, purifying the heart, overflows in all good actions—kind, humane, benevolent; not only to the good, but to the evil. This is the true philosophy. Correct the spring—the fountain. "*Make the tree good.*" Engraft a new scion on the old stock. Infuse new life. Warm the heart by the wonderful love of God, exhibited and sealed by the blood of his Son. Let this love, this pure benevolence, this genuine philanthropy, but reach the soul of man, and then all is pure within and moral without.

"Talk they of morals! O thou bleeding Love,
The chief morality is love of Thee."

What law could never do, though as holy, just, and good as the

constitution of Israel, through the weakness of the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, has done; he has condemned sin, wounded it, and killed it by a most transcendently glorious display of love.

Where are Mr. Owen's weapons to reform the world? He dare not, in fact he does not, pretend to reform the world. He owns he has nothing to propose adequate to the task; and, therefore, only promises to save the next generation by a whimsical arrangement of circumstances. He proposes to grow better men and women, *not to improve the present race.* And what is the pith of his philosophy? Why, it is this: *Transplant a crab tree and it becomes an apple tree.* But the great reformer's philosophy was, *engraft a new scion.* Such is the exact difference between the scheme of Mr. Owen and the founder of christianity.

But let us have a word from Paul on the contrast between the Jewish and christian religion. I will, for the sake of dispatch, paraphrase a part of the fourth chapter to the Galatians, thus: "Now I say, the heir, as long as he is a minor, differs in no respect from a slave, though he be lord of all; for he is kept under tutors and stewards until he is of age, or until the time appointed in the will of his father. Just so it was with us Jews, while in our minority, which was during the dominion of the old constitution; we were kept in bondage, restrained, and curbed by the elements, or leading principles of that institution of law. But when the fullness of time appointed by our father in his will had come, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, and born under the old constitution, that he might be a *fellow-subject* (I cannot say fellow-citizen) with us under that constitution, that he might be constitutionally qualified to buy us off out of the slavery of *the letter;* that we might be elevated from the rank of trembling slaves, to the adoption of sons. And now, having been raised to the rank of sons, God has, under a *new constitution*, given us the spirit of his Son in our hearts; so that we confidently and affectionately say, as little children speak, *Abba Father.* Now, my brethren of the Jews, once subjects of the old constitution, you are no more *bondmen* but *sons* in feeling, in spirit, and in truth, too, by relation; and if sons, you know you are heirs of God through his Son, the Messiah. Well, then, brethren, you will never, I hope, desire to be under the old constitution again; but, I trust, you will stand firm in the liberty which you enjoy of serving God under the new constitution, not *in the oldness of the letter* but *in a new spirit.*"

Often does Paul rally upon this point: You christians are "*not under law, but under favor;*" sin shall not, then, have power to lord it over you, seeing you are not under the condemning genius of law, but under the pardoning, reconciling, purifying, and ennobling genius of favor.

This is the genius of christianity. By Moses came the age of law. By Jesus the Messiah came the reign of favor. So sang the

angels when they announced his birth, "Glory to God in the highest heavens; Peace on earth, and good will among men." *Letters* only reach the eyes, but *favor* can touch the heart. Laws expressed in words assail the ears and aim at restraining actions; but love pierces to the heart, and disarms the rising thought of mischievous intent. It is called the reign of Heaven, because down into the heart it draws the heavenly feelings, desires, and aims. From heaven it came, and to heaven it leads. I will shake the heavens and the earth, says the Lord. I will revolutionize the world; and how, my friends, but by introducing new principles of human actions?

Paul informs us that the new constitution is every way better than the old one. The Mediator is superior to Moses—its provisions better—its seal and pledges better. It runs in a few sentences. It promises:

1. To write the law upon the heart. That is, to implant the principle, which induces to all the good and pious works which the law demanded, and which will exclude the necessity of law taking cognizance only of the outward deeds.

2. It promises to all subjects *the remission of all sins;* and, consequently, banishes all guilt and fear from the conscience.

3. It assures all the citizens of having a just knowledge of God; and,

4. It promises that God himself shall be theirs, and they his.

Now let me ask, what is wanting in this new constitution (and this is the whole of it), to make men just what reason says they ought to be—to make them good companions and happy in themselves?

How much happiness is there in doing good? All this happiness is theirs, for it imparts the disposition. How much happiness is there in having all fear of death, all guilt and shame removed from the soul of man? This happiness is theirs. How much happiness in seeing all our fellow-citizens knowing the character of God, his will, and designs with regard to the whole human race, and all rejoicing in God? This happiness is theirs. And how much real felicity is there in having all the treasures of God, all the riches of the heavenly inheritance in prospect; as well as all assurance given us that on earth we shall never be deserted nor forsaken by the Lord? Now all these are *constitutional* privileges belonging to *every citizen* of this kingdom—to every one under the new constitution. There is not one citizen in the kingdom, of which this is the constitution, who has not in his heart the law of love written; not one who does not know God; not one who has not all his sins forgiven; not one who has not a good hope of the heavenly and eternal inheritance. Such is the unexaggerated character, genius, and design of the new constitution, or christian religion.

We are not, my friends, to suppose that the patriarchal, Jewish, and christian religions, as we call them, are three distinct religions.

They are but one religion. The seed was sown in the patriarchal age; the plant sprung up and put forth its leaves and blossoms under the cultivation of the Jewish; it ripened and was matured under the christian. Favor was *promised* under the patriarchal, was *symbolized* and shadowed forth under the Jewish, and accomplished and realized under the new constitution. The first formed good individuals; the second, while held sacred, made a happy nation, and comparatively a moral people; but the third fills men with heavenly influence; with peace, and joy, and righteousness, and can make, and will terminate in, a pure and happy world.

Mahometanism is only a corruption and perversion of Judaism and christianity. Idolatry is but a perversion and corruption of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations. The apostasy or anti-Christ is but a corruption of christianity, a heterogeneous commixture of Judaism, paganism, and christianity. There has been but one religion ever in the world. In other words, the fountain whence all superstitions have originated, was one and the same. Hence we find the prominent ideas of divine revelation in every superstition on earth. As we trace languages to a common fountain and origin, so we trace religions. Idolatry and polytheism were the worst of all the corruptions in degrading man. But as the sweetest wine will make the sourest vinegar, christianity when corrupted has exhibited the most cruelty and tyranny. Hence the Inquisition has been the most cruel and wicked tribunal upon this earth. The fine, vigorous, plethoric constitution, when subdued by a malignant fever, exhibits the greatest mass of corruption. But who argues hence that a fine, vigorous, and healthy constitution is a curse, shocks all common sense.

But the root of all the corruptions of christianity was the incorporating with it the opinions and speculations of Egyptian and Indian philosophy. All the systems flourishing upon the earth when Jesus was born were, with the exception of the Jewish (and that we all know, was much corrupted), mere systems of abstract opinions and speculations. Grecian and Roman, as well as the eastern philosophy, had filled all the reasoning part of society with the most air-built and visionary schemes about matter and mind, creation and providence. Conversions from these ranks, from all the sects of philosophers, polluted, finally polluted, the christian sanctuary. So that christianity became with them a science, a fit subject of speculation as much as any of the doctrines of Plato or Socrates. From these unhallowed commixtures sprang the creed systems of ancient and modern times, so that finally almost every vestige of the ancient simplicity and the true genius of christianity disappeared, and various schemes of sectarian and philosophic christianity succeeded and supplanted it.

This creed system has been the fruitful source of all the corruptions in morals, as well as the parent of all the religious discords now in christendom. But for it Deism, Atheism, and Skepticism

would have found no resting-place among us. Many of the skeptics, and even Mr. Owen himself, have been attacking antichrist and thought they were opposing Christ. They have not the disposition to discriminate between what christianity is, and the abuses of it. It requires but little logical acumen to detect the sophistry, and but moderate powers of declamation to expose the fooleries, of most of the systems and exhibitions of christianity. And he must be dull of apprehension who has not felt, in this discussion, that Mr. Owen has been fighting against the perversions of christianity, rather than against the religion of facts, of morals, and of happiness which our Redeemer has established in the world. But matter and mind, body and spirit, in their greatest supposed opposition to each other, are not greater contrasts than a religion of opinions and a religion of facts.

And here I beg leave to illustrate this distinction very briefly. It seems to have been abundantly proved, before the christian era, that opinions are too feeble to stimulate to virtue and goodness, and too impotent to restrain from vice and immorality. Correct opinions, we see in our own times, will not purify the heart, nor reform the life. Nothing that must be argued out by a long process of ratiocination, can be of much power in regulating human conduct. Its strength is exhausted by the time the point is proved. And it must be evident to all that a system which requires much reason to comprehend, would be most unsuitable to the great mass of mankind. A thousand persons can believe a fact, for every one that can comprehend a logical process of reasoning. Opinions, too, are, after all, but probabilities. They can never rise higher than a strong probability; but faith produces, in many instances, absolute certainty, and is, in the very constitution of human nature, evidently intended to be a common and a most powerful principle of action. But opinions are not, in the constitution of human nature, ever intended to be a common, nor a powerful principle of action. They are only to govern us, or to teach us to move with caution, or sometimes not to move at all, in the absence of faith and knowledge. Faith and knowledge are the governing principles of action, and opinion is only to be consulted in the absence of these two.

The Messiah, well knowing what was in man, adapted his religion to the nature and wants of men, and hence made its reforming, purifying, and saving efficacy to consist in the belief of naked facts; facts which, when believed, have an intrinsic, inherent, and inalienable power to govern a man's thoughts, wishes, motives, and conduct. The christian's creed, then, runs in the following style: I believe that Jesus was the son of Mary and the son of God; that he cured all sorts of human maladies by his power; was persecuted and rejected by his own nation; crucified, buried, and rose again, and ascended into heaven. Whatever *was done or said* by him, reported and attested by his companions, who were his witnesses to the ends of the earth and the end of time, constitutes a legitimate

article of the christian's creed. If there have been one hundred well attested facts, there are a hundred articles in the christian's creed. This is the only way that a reasonable and an intelligent man can enumerate the articles of his belief. But because all the facts, minor and major, in the evangelical histories, are comprised or rather terminate in the death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ—nay, indeed, in *one* THAT HE ROSE AGAIN *by the power of the Father;* the Apostle identified the belief of these with salvation; or, in other words, he said: "If you confess with your lips the Lord Jesus, and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you shall be saved." This belief, as far as faith is concerned, brings a man into the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

But how different this from creeds of human construction! They begin and proceed with the mere assertion of abstract views—such as the omnipresence and omnisciency of God; the purposes and decrees of the Almighty; abstract views of the fall of man; his physical and moral powers; various schemes of redemption; the nature of faith, atonement, and righteousness, etc. etc. Moses did not thus frame a creed for the Jews. He lays down no definition of God, but launches off thus: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The Apostles begin their creed in the same style: "In those days came John the immerser proclaiming and saying," etc. Such is the difference between the creed of christians and philosophers. The Presbyterian, Baptist, Episcopalian, and Methodistic creeds are so many systems of religious philosophy, built, as they suppose, upon the Bible; just as Sir Isaac's system of nature is built upon the material universe. But the old-fashioned creed of the first christians ran in such sentences as these: "The Lord is risen, indeed, and has appeared to Peter." "God has commanded reformation and forgiveness of sins to be proclaimed to all nations under heaven," etc.

But up comes a grave, religious, philosophic sectary, and says, in a very serious mood, Why, Sir, thousands believe your gospel facts, and they have no more influence upon them than the belief of the Mussulman in the mission of Mahomet. *How will you account for this?* I tell you, Sir, you are the cause yourself. You have taught them to think that such a belief is good for nothing, and in believing you the facts are neutralized, just as acids and alkalies form new substances, and neutralize each other. It is so in the minds of men. A lie may be believed along with truth—and the particular lie and particular truth taught in one sermon, equally believed, render one or both inoperative. Hence it is that the most valuable truths are inoperative. A person who has been taught all his life that nothing but silver and gold can purchase food and raiment, might be presented with a bank bill worth *ten thousand dollars*, and yet, under the belief that it was not money, might perish with hunger or cold in the absence of gold and silver, thinking that he had no money to go to market; but let some person teach him that this bank bill, by a

new agreement of society, was, by appointment or law, good for ten thousand pieces of silver; the moment he is persuaded of this, he feels himself rich, and rejoices with exceeding joy. So let a person be undeceived on this cardinal point, and be taught, that to believe that *Jesus Christ rose from the dead*, to be assured of this fact, is all that is necessary to constitute saving faith, or such a belief as will, if obeyed, introduce a man into the kingdom of heaven, and a correspondent joy and gladness must ensue.

Ah! my friends, the dogmas which represent the scriptures as a sealed book, and that teach that new revelations must be given to open the seals, or all that is written is useless; the dogmas which teach that saving faith is a principle wrought in the heart independent of the testimony of God, that faith is the consequence of regeneration; that a man must be first saved, then believe, and all their kindred dogmas, have put weapons into the hands of the adversary of our faith, as well as have made the word of God of none effect in the hearts and lives of all who believe them. Many skeptics mistake the dross of mere human doctrines and dogmas for the pure gold of christianity.

Men have, under the dominion of opinions, been made to love and hate one another for the agreement or collision of their opinions. But under the dominion of faith they are taught to allow a difference of opinions. There is but "*one faith*," but nowhere is it written that there is but *one opinion*. All christians are in reality of one faith; for all believe the gospel facts, and he that does not believe the gospel facts cannot be a christian. But the Apostle Paul positively commanded all christians to maintain the "*unity of the faith*," and to "receive one another without regard to differences of opinion." There is only one faith, but many opinions, and many different degrees of knowledge; and christianity makes allowances for these.

A *sub* and a *supra* prefixed to the word *lapsarian*, or the letter *i* in the word *omousios*, or *omoiousios*, have made different communities under the banners of him, who, in his own person, and by his apostles, condescended to all the weaknesses and dullness of intellect found in man or woman who loved his person. Sectaries have forgotten that *God is love*, as manifested in Jesus Christ to the world; that all christianity is resolvable into this grand truth, that "*God so loved the world as to send his only begotten Son into the world, that* WHOSOEVER *believeth in him might be saved.*" Who, believing this, can think that he would condemn a person that loved him because he could not apprehend the metaphysical import of a prefixed *sub* or *supra*, or an intermediate *i*?

Little children can apprehend and approve the gospel facts, as well, or as firmly as Sir Isaac Newton did. But they cannot understand any of the abstract dogmas of the various philosophic sects. Why then exclude them from the fold of Christ? The Apostle John addressed the congregations of his time as composed of old men,

young men, and children. That they were literally such, appears from his address to each. The old men had known Jesus Christ from the beginning of the proclamation concerning him. The young men had overcome the world, notwithstanding the strength of youthful passions. And the little children had begun well, they had been baptized, they had just received the remission of their sins. All these had, however, one faith, believed the same facts; but of very different attainments, both in knowledge and in behavior. How foolish those systems that require all men to be of one standard height in religious opinion; which will have the iron bedstead of Procrustes for fixing the stature to which every man must grow, on peril of losing his head or his soul!

The genius of christianity is love. Its tendency is peace on earth and good-will among men — and it will eventuate in glory to God and man in the highest heaven. It contemplates the reformation of the world upon a new principle. It aims at conquering men by love. And he is a superficial philosopher who cannot see that this is the only rational way to promote purity and happiness—for these are inseparable companions—*Happy the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* And no system which leaves man not in the possession of a quiet conscience can bestow him happiness. Love has a transfiguring or transforming efficacy upon the human mind. To impress the image of God upon the human heart, it is necessary that the love of God should be exhibited to the human mind. Men cannot be made to love by commands and threats—that would be most *unphilosophic.* If we would have men to love, we must present an amiable object. This is God's method. To fill men with love to him, he shows them that he loves them. They say, "*we love him because he first loved us.*" That system which promotes, or is calculated to promote, the greatest degree of love among men, is the most philosophic plan for purifying and reforming the world. This Mr. Owen's system has lost sight of. There is nothing in it to produce love. It wants an object, amiable and magnificent, to arouse reflection, admiration, and love in man. Eating and drinking and lodging in the same apartments, are all the stimulus he has to present to the human mind to promote love. And yet who does not know that the fastings, and watchings, and hardships, and dangers of a single campaign, or of a shipwreck, will produce more kind feelings and solicitude for the welfare of our companions, than the feasting together for years, at the same festive board, is capable of producing? If men were to rack their ingenuity to eternity, to invent a scheme for promulging love and good-will among men, they could find nothing half comparable to the christian scheme. It finds men hated and hating one another, full of bitterness and wrath, yet all in the same calamity. It teaches them that they are all shipwrecked, bankrupts, miserable, and wretched. It makes them feel this; and then presents them with the love of God, sealed by the death of his Son.

But as yet we have said nothing about *doctrine*. True, indeed, we have not spoken of the *doctrines* of the gospel. This word is not in the plural form when applied to the truths of christianity. We sometimes read of the *doctrines* of demons; but it is only the *doctrine* of Christ. When this term does not mean *teaching*, which it often does, it simply denotes the meaning of the facts. Hence the meaning of any fact, such as the death or burial of Jesus Christ, is the doctrine of the death or burial of Christ. As is the *moral* to the tale, so is the *doctrine* to the fact. Hence all who believe the facts and understand the meaning of them, have the sound or wholesome doctrine of Christ. Some may, we admit, believe the facts and not understand the meaning of them. In such a case, the facts believed will either not operate at all, or have a morbid influence. The apostolic epistles, so far as *doctrinal*, are expressive of the meaning of the gospel facts. They taught the new converts the legitimate bearing and results of the facts believed. The other parts of these letters were exhortatory, or deductions from the facts, calculated to direct and comfort christians. But all the doctrine of Christ grew out of the facts, just as all christian faith is founded upon the testimony concerning them.

Two sentences found in John's writings explain the whole design of both the historical and epistolary parts of the apostle's writings. The design of the historical books is thus expressed by John: "Many other signs, truly, did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these that are written, are written that you might believe that *Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God;* and that believing *you might have life through his name.*" The design of the epistolary part he has as clearly expressed: "These things do we write to you, brethren, *that your joy may be complete,*" or that you may know the things which have been gifted to you from God.

Having so far glanced at the genius and design of the christian scriptures, and the christian religion, and remotely at its tendencies, we shall give place to Soame Jenyns again on the tendency of this religion. The extract which I am about to read, not only shows the natural tendency of this religion, but constitutes a formidable argument in proof of its authenticity. For as I hinted to you before; this erudite and acute statesman triumphantly proves the Divine authority of this religion, *from the religion itself*, or what is not unfrequently termed, the *internal* evidence—concerning the object of this religion, he says: pages 13–16.

"First then, the object of this religion is entirely new, and is this: to prepare us by a state of probation for the kingdom of heaven. This is everywhere professed by Christ and his Apostles to be the chief end of the christian's life; the crown for which he is to contend, the goal to which he is to run, the harvest which is to pay him for all his labors. Yet, previous to their preaching no such prize was ever hung out to mankind, nor any means prescribed for the attainment of it.

"It is indeed true, that some of the philosophers of antiquity entertained notions of a future state, but mixed with much doubt and uncertainty. Their legislators also endeavored to infuse into the minds of the people a belief of rewards and punishments after death; but by this they only intended to give a sanction to their laws, and to enforce the practice of virtue for the benefit of mankind in the present life. This alone seems to have been their end, and a meritorious end it was; but christianity not only operates more effectually to this end, but has a nobler design in view; which is, by a proper education here, to render us fit members of a celestial society hereafter. In all former religions, the good of the present life was the first object; in the christian, it is but the second. In those, men were incited to promote that good by the hopes of a future reward; in this, the practice of virtue is enjoined in order to qualify them for that reward. There is a great difference, I apprehend, in these two plans; that is, in adhering to virtue from its present utility in expectation of a future happiness, and living in such a manner as to qualify us for the acceptance, and the enjoyment of that happiness; and the conduct and disposition of those, who act on these different principles, must be no less different. On the first, the constant practice of justice, temperance, and sobriety, will be sufficient; but on the latter, we must add to these an habitual piety, faith, resignation, and contempt of the world. The first may make us very good citizens, but will produce but a tolerable christian. Hence it is that christianity insists more strongly, than any preceding institution, religious or moral, on purity of heart, and a benevolent disposition; because these are absolutely necessary to its great end. But in those whose recommendations of virtue regard the present life only, and whose promised rewards in another, were low and sensual, no preparatory qualifications were requisite to enable men to practice the one, or to enjoy the other; and, therefore, we see this object is peculiar to this religion, and with it was entirely new.

"But although this object, and the principles on which it is founded were new, and perhaps undiscoverable by reason, yet when discovered, they are so consonant to it, that we cannot but readily assent to them. For the truth of this principle, that the present life is a state of probation and education, to prepare us for another, is confirmed by everything which we see around us. It is the only key which can open to us the designs of Providence in the economy of human affairs; the only clue which can guide us through that pathless wilderness, and the only plan on which this world could possibly have been formed, or on which the history of it can be comprehended or explained. It could never have been formed on a plan of happiness, because it is everywhere overspread with innumerable miseries; nor of misery, because it is interspersed with many enjoyments. It could not have been constituted for a scene of wisdom and virtue, because the history of mankind is little more than a detail of their follies, and wickedness; nor of vice, because that is no

plan at all, being destructive of all existence, and consequently of its own. But on this system all that we here meet with, may be easily accounted for; for this mixture of happiness and misery, of virtue and vice, necessarily results from a state of probation and education; as probation implies trials, sufferings, and a capacity of offending; and education, a propriety of chastisement for those offenses."*

More has been read here than is necessary to our object, the prominent idea on which we emphasize is, that the *tendency* of this religion is to produce purity of heart as essential to present and future happiness; not to obtain it as a reward, but to prepare ourselves for the enjoyment of it. A person to sustain any character must have a previous training. A plain unlettered man would feel himself but ill at ease among the polished grandees of this world; his taste, education, and habits would disqualify him for all enjoyments in their society. Now, this is the prominent design of the christian religion, not only to reveal a future state, but to prepare us for the enjoyment of it. A design so apparent in the volume as to make it a *miracle*, to me at least, how any person could conceive the authors of it to be bad men, deceivers, or impostors.

That the object or design of the christian religion is not political, needs scarcely to be proved; when speaking of the personal character of this religion, Mr. Jenyns very forcibly remarks, pages 20–22:

"And here I cannot omit observing, that the personal character of the author of this religion is no less new, and extraordinary, than the religion itself, who 'spake as never man spake,' and lived as never man lived. In proof of this, I do not mean to allege, that he fasted forty days, that he performed a variety of miracles, and after being buried three days, that he arose from the dead; because these accounts will have but little effect on the minds of unbelievers, who if they believe not the religion, will give no credit to the relation of these facts; but I will prove it from facts which cannot be disputed. For instance, he is the only founder of a religion in the history of mankind, which is totally unconnected with all human policy and government, and therefore totally unconducive to any worldly purpose whatever. All others, Mahomet, Numa, and even Moses himself, blended their religious institutions with their civil, and by them obtained dominion over their respective people; but Christ neither aimed at, nor would accept of any such power, he rejected every object, which all other men pursue, and made choice of all those which others fly from, and are afraid of. He refused power, riches, honors, and pleasure; and courted poverty, ignominy, tortures, and death. Many have been the enthusiasts, and impostors, who have endeavored to impose on the world pretended revelations, and some

* See the same train of thought ingeniously pursued in one of the Spectators of Addison, in which he considers *heaven* not so much the *reward* as the consequence of virtuous actions.—*Reporter.*

of them from pride, obstinacy, or principle, have gone so far as to lay down their lives, rather than retract. But I defy history to show one, who ever made his own sufferings and death a necessary part of his original plan, and essential to his mission; this Christ actually did; he foresaw, foretold, declared their necessity, and voluntarily endured them. If we seriously contemplate the divine lessons, the perfect precepts, the beautiful discourses, and the consistent conduct of this wonderful person, we cannot possibly imagine, that he could have been either an idiot or a madman; and yet, if he was not what he pretended to be, he can be considered in no other light. And even under this character he would deserve some attention, because of so sublime and rational an insanity there is no other instance in the history of mankind."

In speaking of the moral character and tendency of the christian religion the same very acute writer observes: "That every moral precept founded on reason, is carried to a higher degree of purity and perfection than in any other system of the ancient philosophers of preceding ages—every moral precept, founded on false principles is entirely omitted, and many new precepts added, peculiarly corresponding with the new object of this religion." From these peculiarities he deduces a very powerful argument in proof of its Divine origin. The first item has been frequently noticed by other writers. But few have spoken more explicitly on the false virtues omitted in the christian religion, though universally applauded in all other religions. These false virtues are, *valor*, *patriotism*, and *friendship*. His remarks upon these three being very brief, I beg leave to read them. Pages 31–36.

"Valor, for instance, or active courage, is for the most part constitutional, and therefore can have no more claim to moral merit, than wit, beauty, health, strength, or any other endowment of the mind or body; and so far is it from producing any salutary effects by introducing peace, order, or happiness into society, that it is the usual perpetrator of all the violences, which, from retaliated injuries, distract the world with bloodshed and devastation. It is the engine by which the strong are enabled to plunder the weak, the proud to trample upon the humble, and the guilty to oppress the innocent. It is the chief instrument which ambition employs in her unjust pursuits of wealth and power, and is therefore so much extolled by her votaries. It was, indeed, congenial with the religion of Pagans, whose gods were, for the most part, made out of deceased heroes, exalted to heaven as a reward for the mischiefs which they had perpetrated upon earth, and therefore, with them this was the first of virtues, and had even engrossed that denomination to itself; but whatever merit it may have assumed among Pagans, with christians it can pretend to none, and few or none are the occasions in which they are permitted to exert it. They are so far from being allowed to inflict evil, that they are forbid even to resist it; they are so far from being encouraged to revenge injuries, that one of their first

duties is to forgive them; so far from being incited to destroy their enemies, that they are commanded to love them, and to serve them to the utmost of their power. If christian nations, therefore, were nations of christians, all war would be impossible and unknown among them, and valor could be neither of use nor estimation, and therefore could never have a place in the catalogue of christian virtues, being irreconcilable with all its precepts. I object not to the praise and honors bestowed on the valiant, they are the least tribute which can be paid them by those who enjoy safety and affluence by the intervention of their dangers and sufferings; I assert only that active courage can never be a christian virtue, because a christian can have nothing to do with it. Passive courage is indeed frequently, and properly inculcated by this meek and suffering religion, under the titles of patience and resignation, a real and substantial virtue this, and a direct contrast to the former; for passive courage arises from the noblest dispositions of the human mind, for a contempt of misfortunes, pain, and death, and confidence in the protection of the Almighty; active, from the meanest; from passion, vanity, and self-dependence. Passive courage is derived from a zeal for truth, and a perseverance in duty; active, is the offspring of pride and revenge, and the parent of cruelty and injustice. In short, passive courage is the resolution of a philosopher; active, the ferocity of a savage. Nor is this more incompatible with the precepts, than with the object of this religion, which is the attainment of the kingdom of heaven; for valor is not that sort of violence by which that kingdom is to be taken; nor are the turbulent spirits of heroes and conquerors admissible into those regions of peace, subordination, and tranquillity.

"Patriotism also, that celebrated virtue, so much practiced in ancient, and so much professed in modern times; that virtue, which so long preserved the liberties of Greece, and exalted Rome to the empire of the world; this celebrated virtue, I say, must also be excluded; because it not only falls short of, but directly counteracts, the extensive benevolence of, this religion. A christian is of no country; he is a citizen of the world; and his neighbors and countrymen are the inhabitants of the remotest regions, whenever their distresses demand his friendly assistance. Christianity commands us to love all mankind; patriotism, to oppress all other countries to advance the imaginary prosperity of our own. Christianity enjoins us to imitate the universal benevolence of our Creator, who pours forth his blessings on every nation upon earth; patriotism, to copy the mean partiality of an English parish officer, who thinks injustice and cruelty meritorious, whenever they promote the interests of his own inconsiderable village. This has ever been a favorite virtue with mankind, because it conceals self-interest under the mask of public spirit, not only from others, but even from themselves, and gives a license to inflict wrongs and injuries, not only with impunity, but with applause; but it is so diametrically opposite to the great

characteristic of this institution, that it never could have been admitted into the list of christian virtues.

"Friendship likewise, although more congenial to the principles of christianity, arising from more tender and amiable dispositions, could never gain admittance among her benevolent precepts for the same reason; because it is too narrow and confined, and appropriates that benevolence to a single object, which is here commanded to be extended to all. Where friendship arises from similarity of sentiments, and disinterested affections, they are advantageous, agreeable, and innocent, but have little pretensions to merit; for it is justly observed, 'If ye love them, which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them.' But if they are formed from alliance in parties, factions, and in interests, or from a participation of vices, the usual parents of what are called friendships among mankind, they are then both mischievous and criminal, and consequently forbidden, but in their utmost purity deserve no recommendation from this religion."

As Mr. Jenyns, though a very honorable member of the British Parliament, dared to avow that *patriotism* was not one of the christian virtues, we may add that even the policy which we so much approbate in this community under the name of "*The American System,*" though most unquestionably good policy, is a very bright example of the correctness of his remarks upon patriotism. The patriotism of Great Britain would not permit her to buy the products of our soil; and our patriotism will not permit us to buy the products of her mechanical labors; she will compel her own subjects to suffer rather than purchase our corn and flour; and we will endeavor to deprive the manufacturing classes in Great Britain of the means of subsistence to hold up our own. All this is good policy and good patriotism, but no part of the christian religion. To call this a *virtue* may be correct in politics, or economics: but in the christian religion it would pass for a false virtue, and very justly, according to the genius of this religion, which embraces all christians in its affection, and all mankind in its benevolence.

Some have rather censured than applauded some of the precepts found in the "*sermon on the mount.*" Pretty thing, indeed, say they, to be commanded "to turn the other cheek to him that has already smitten us once;" and to go "two miles with him that compels us to go one." Yes, indeed, a pretty thing for the proud and retaliating! But the question is, Which is the speedier way to end a controversy? Now take the precept literally, and doubt not the controversy will be sooner terminated, and less danger will be incurred by turning the other cheek than by striking back; and we will sooner get rid of an unprofitable companion by going two miles with him, than to stop and quarrel on the road. Now, taking them *literally*, which is not in accordance with the genius of such maxims, or the Savior's intention, I presume; but, I say, take them literally, and they are, in

their tendency, better than any other course which can be pursued to terminate the quarrel.

But christianity inculcates many virtues unknown and untaught before, each of which demonstrates its divinity and excellent tendency. I will prefer taking notice of them in the words of Mr. Jenyns to my own desultory remarks.

On the beatitude which says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," he remarks:

"This was so new, and so opposite to the ideas of all pagan moralists that they thought this temper of mind a criminal and contemptible meanness, which must induce men to sacrifice the glory of their country, and their own honor, to a shameful pusillanimity; and such it appears to almost all who are called christians, even at this day, who not only reject it in practice, but disavow it in principle, notwithstanding this explicit declaration of their Master. We see them revenging the smallest affronts by premeditated murder, as individuals, on principles of honor; and, in their national capacities, destroying each other with fire and sword, for the low considerations of commercial interests, the balance of rival powers, or the ambition of princes. We see them with their last breath animating each other to a savage revenge, and in the agonies of death, plunging with feeble arms, their daggers into the hearts of their opponents; and what is still worse, we hear all these barbarisms celebrated by historians, flattered by poets, applauded in theaters, approved in senates, and even sanctified in pulpits. But universal practice cannot alter the nature of things, nor universal error change the nature of truth. Pride was not made for man, but humility, meekness, and resignation; that is, poorness of spirit was made for man, and properly belongs to his dependent and precarious situation; and is the only disposition of mind which can enable him to enjoy ease and quiet here, and happiness hereafter. Yet was this important precept entirely unknown until it was promulgated by him who said, 'suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven; verily, I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.'"

Another precept, equally new and no less excellent, is forgiveness of injuries. "You have heard," says Christ to his disciples, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy; but I say unto you, love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you." This was a lesson so new and so utterly unknown, until taught by his doctrine, and enforced by his example, that the wisest moralists of the wisest nations and ages, represented the desire of revenge as a mark of a noble mind, and the accomplishment of it as one of the chief felicities attendant on a fortunate man. But how much more magnanimous, how much more beneficial to mankind, is

forgiveness! It is more magnanimous, because every generous and exalted disposition of the human mind is requisite to the practice of it; for these alone can enable us to bear the wrongs and insults of wickedness and folly with patience, and to look down on the perpetrators of them with pity rather than with indignation; these alone can teach us, that such are but a part of those sufferings allotted to us in this state of probation, and to know, that to overcome evil with good, is the most glorious of all victories; it is the most beneficial, because this amiable conduct alone can put an end to an eternal succession of injuries and retaliations; for every retaliation becomes a new injury, and requires another act of revenge for satisfaction. But would we observe this salutary precept, to love our enemies, and to do good to those who despitefully use us; this obstinate benevolence would at last conquer the most inveterate hearts, and we should have no enemies to forgive. How much more exalted a character, therefore, is a christian martyr, suffering with resignation, and praying for the guilty, than a pagan hero, breathing revenge and destroying the innocent! Yet noble and useful as this virtue is, before the appearance of this religion, it was not only unpracticed, but decried in principle as mean and ignominious, though so obvious a remedy for most of the miseries of this life, and so necessary a qualification for the happiness of another." Pp. 39–42.

After specifying other virtues never before promulged, such as what he calls faith, repentance, humility, and universal benevolence, he concludes with these remarks, pp. 51–55:

It cannot be denied that the Great Author of the Christian Institution, first and singly ventured to oppose all the chief principles of pagan virtue, and to introduce a religion directly opposite to those erroneous, though long established opinions, both in its duties and in its object. The most celebrated virtues of the ancients were, high spirit, intrepid courage, and implacable resentment.

"*Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer*, was the portrait of the most illustrious hero, drawn by one of the first poets of antiquity. To all these admired qualities, those of a true christian are an exact contrast; for this religion constantly enjoins poorness of spirit, meekness, patience, and forgiveness of injuries. 'But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.' The favorite characters among the Pagans, were the turbulent, ambitious, and intrepid, who, through toils and dangers, acquired wealth and spent it in luxury, magnificence, and corruption; but both these are equally adverse to the christian system which forbids all extraordinary efforts to obtain wealth, care to secure, or thought concerning the enjoyment of it. 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth,' etc. 'Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed? for after all these things do the Gentiles seek.' The chief object of the Pagans was immortal fame: for this their poets sang, their heroes fought, and their patriots died; and

this was hung out by their philosophers and legislators, as the great incitement to all noble and virtuous deeds. But what says the christian legislator to his disciples on this subject? 'Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake; rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven.' So widely different is the genius of the pagan and christian morality that I will venture to affirm that the most celebrated virtues of the former are more opposite to the spirit, and more inconsistent with the end of the latter, than even their most infamous vices; and that a Brutus wrenching vengeance out of his hands to whom alone it belongs, by murdering the oppressor of his country, or a Cato murdering himself from an impatience of control, leaves the world more unqualified for, and more inadmissible into the kingdom of heaven, than even a Messalina, or a Heliogabalus, with all their profligacy about them.

"Nothing, I believe, has so much contributed to corrupt the true spirit of the christian institution, as that partiality which we contract from our earliest education for the manners of pagan antiquity; from whence we learn to adopt every moral idea, which is repugnant to it; to applaud false virtues which that disavows; to be guided by laws of honor, which that abhors; to imitate characters which that detests; and to behold heroes, patriots, conquerors, and suicides, with admiration, whose conduct that utterly condemns. From a coalition of these opposite principles was generated that monstrous system of cruelty and benevolence, of barbarism and civility, of rapine and justice, of fighting and devotion, of revenge and generosity, which harassed the world for several centuries with crusades, holy wars, knight-errantry, and single combats, and even still retains influence enough, under the name of honor, to defeat the most beneficent ends of this holy institution. I mean not by this to pass any censure on the principles of valor, patriotism, or honor; they may be useful, and perhaps necessary, in the commerce and business of the present turbulent and imperfect state; and those who are actuated by them may be virtuous, honest, and even religious men; all that I assert is, that they cannot be christians. A profligate may be a christian, though a bad one, because he may be overpowered by passions and temptations, and his actions may contradict his principles; but a man whose ruling principle is honor, however virtuous he may be, cannot be a christian, because he erects a standard of duty, and deliberately adheres to it, diametrically opposite to the whole tenor of that religion."

To conclude, the direct tendency of the christian religion is to purify the heart, and to make men everything which the perfect happiness of society requires. After Paul had gone into a long detail of christian virtues, he concludes in his sweeping style, which suffers not one virtue to escape: "Finally, brethren, whatever things are true, whatever things are venerable, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure, whatever things are amiable, whatever things

are of good fame; if there be any virtue, and if any praise be due, think on, and practice these things."

One miracle there is, which Mr. Owen must believe at all events, on the whole premises before us. He must believe that a set of vile impostors, deceivers of the basest stamp, the greatest cheats and liars that ever lived, did give birth to the *purest* system of morality the world ever saw—did recommend the practice of every virtue which human reason in the most cultivated state of society can admire and approve. He must believe that all the true religion and genuine virtue now existing depends upon the forgeries of a pack of charlatans, who went about from place to place declaring that they had heard what they never did hear, and that they had seen what they never saw. This miracle Mr. Owen must believe, which is a miracle of a more incredible character than any one in the volume, especially when we take into view the circumstances attendant on the progress and sufferings of these wicked impostors.

"If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?"

But still I have not made sufficiently emphatic the tendency of christianity upon every one who embraces it. This I will again lay before you. It becomes the more necessary to call this up again, because our opponent execrates christianity more because of its "idle fears and terrors" than on any other account. To me, from childhood, it has seemed strange why mankind should more fear the threats than hope for the promises of Jesus Christ. If not to a consciousness of the just desert of all that is threatened, perhaps anterior to any notice of the threats, I know not to what other cause this is to be attributed. For certain it is that threats and promises are equally credible or incredible. They both rest upon the same testimony. Now christianity, if rationally regarded, can never fill but one class of mankind with fears. If it be regarded as a fraud or imposition, its hopes and fears are equally disannulled. If it be regarded as true, what is its truth save pardon and peace to every one who submits to the government of Jesus Christ? No person can, then, be filled with any fears or terrors from the New Testament, *but he that believes and will not obey.* The infidel cannot; the christian cannot. To the infidel it is all a romance; to the christian it is all peace, hope, and joy, real as life itself. Who, then, does christianity make unhappy? The very persons, and none but the persons, it ought to make unhappy, viz: those who believe, and will not obey Jesus Christ. And if it did not make such unhappy, it would be unworthy of its Author and its object. And the man who labors to divest the guilty of his fears is a misanthrope, and not a philanthropist.

But there is a species of corrupt christianity which has made suicides through the false alarms which it creates about things unknown and unknowable. I have nothing to do with it more than with the Alcoran. It is enough for my purpose to show that christianity promises pardon to every human being who voluntarily sub-

mits to the government of Jesus Christ; and this pardon is tendered to them the very instant they bow to the authority of Jesus Christ or enter his kingdom. Hence the first christians always rejoiced, because the moment they were baptized into Jesus Christ, they had put him on as their Savior; or, in other words, had put themselves under the constitution of favor, and sin could no longer lord it over them, for they were not under law. Now all who, like Saul of Tarsus, believed in Jesus Christ, and were baptized for the remission of their sins, as he was, or as the three thousand on Pentecost, could, like the Eunuch, *after baptism,* go on their way *rejoicing.* So that the first christians addressed one another as having their sins forgiven; and, consequently, all guilt, and shame, and fear were removed from their consciences. They did not cease—they could not cease—always to rejoice, with joy unspeakable and full of glory. 'Tis monks and friars and monasteries that have invented the gloomy religion of the times. The first christians were commanded to *rejoice always.* So that the legitimate tendency of the religion of Jesus Christ is to fill all who submit to his government with peace, and joy, and good hope; and to cause them finally to exclaim, "O Death, where now thy sting! O Hades, where now thy victory!"

That such are the inseparable results of a cordial reception of the gospel, or of a sincere submission to the authority of Jesus Christ, all the New Testament might be appealed to in proof. I will only allude to a few cases. Three thousand, pierced to the heart by Peter's discourse in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, so soon as he announces reformation and remission of sins, were baptized *for the remission of their sins,* and straightway they were filled with joy and peace; for they eat their food with gladness, praising God. When many of the Samaritans heard Philip proclaiming the Reign of Favor, they believed and were baptized, both men and women, and then, we learn from Luke, "*there was much joy in that city.*" So it was in all the cities where christianity was embraced. The Apostles taught the christians that God "had forgiven them all trespasses." Of their joy, Peter says: "Whom having not seen you love, but on whom not now looking, but believing, you *rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.*" The forgiveness of sins, the removal of guilt, and the consequent termination of all fear that has torment, were, *in all cases, simultaneous blessings enjoyed by all christians on their putting themselves under the guidance of Jesus Christ.* The *same cause* will produce the *same effect,* and wherever the *ancient gospel* is proclaimed, believed, and obeyed, the same effects will uniformly follow.

Now when we add to these blessings the well-founded hope of a glorious immortality, at the resurrection of the just, we have elevated man to a rank worthy of himself, and made his existence worthy of the GREAT FIRST CAUSE. So that the direct tendency of christianity is to glorify God in the highest degree; to produce peace of mind, joy, and hope in the believers; and to diffuse good-will among men.

The golden paradoxes of Paul speak more in praise of christianity than all the encomiums ever pronounced upon it. To hear men persecuted, reproached, and destitute of almost every earthly comfort, say, "We are *sorrowful, yet always rejoicing;* we are *poor, yet making many rich;* we have *nothing, yet possessing all things,*" transcends all the encomiums from all the orators of Greece, Rome, and England, pronounced upon virtue, the gods, and religion.

Fancy to yourselves, my friends, a society in which such characters shall have the rule, and then you want no poet to describe the millennium to you. Peace, harmony, love, and universal good-will, must be the order of the day. There wants nothing—believe me, my friends, there wants nothing—but a restoration of ancient christianity, and a cordial reception of it, to fill the world with all the happiness, physical, intellectual, and moral, which beings like us in this state of trial could endure—shall I say ?—yes, endure, and enjoy.

But even yet, were we to close our remarks upon the tendencies of christianity, upon the subject of it, and upon society at large, we should fail in doing justice to this item. We must not only speak in general terms of its influences upon the human family; we must look at it in detail. We must ask, *What has it done for* WOMAN? Yes—for woman—created to be the helpmate of man ? In all pagan lands, and even among the Jews, she has been made little else than a slave to the passion and to the tyranny of man. The Jews rather exile her from the synagogue, as altogether animal in her nature; and the rude savage makes her more a beast of burden than a companion for man ; doomed to incessant toils, to all the real drudgeries of life. Paganism, in its most improved forms, leaves her without a taste for rational enjoyment, and without a taste of it. The Jews and Pagans, for ages back, have scarce recognized that she has any claims upon man, more than for food and raiment, and these, indeed, are often dispensed to her without a smile. But some half dozen of female names have come down to us in the annals of Grecian and Roman story, as having attracted much attention from their cotemporaries, or as deserving much admiration from posterity. Natural affection, in defiance of pagan darkness, superstition, and cruelty, did, in some few instances, snatch some individual females from the empire of night, and gave them a place among the reputable characters of antiquity. But the sex, *as such*, were almost universally neglected. But from the time that Gabriel visited the cottage of *Mary*, the mother of our Lord, down to the present, wherever christianity has found its way, the female sex has been emancipated from ignorance, bondage, and obscurity. It has been the aim and the glory of christianity, my female friends, to elevate your sex from the degradation of Paganism, and to make you the rational, the useful, and the amiable companion of man. To it you are indebted for that influence which you now possess, and ought to possess, in forming the character of man. While christianity had made you not the inferior, but the companion and the equal of man, it has taught you that you are to pay the impost

which, for this honor, it has laid you under. That is, that you are to bring up your offspring in the discipline and education which the Lord enjoins; that you are to use all your influence in casting the minds of those under your control, into the mould of the Apostle's doctrine. This is the way you can perpetuate the blessings which you enjoy, and leave behind you sons and daughters, who will feel themselves equals, and mutually love, honor, and esteem one another. Let me remind you that there are more individuals of your sex, honored in the New Testament, more of them named, more of them applauded, and more true courtesy shown them, than is to be found in all the other works of the Augustan age; and let all the world know that in the New Testament, it is a maxim that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female, but that both sexes are one in all moral, religious, and social privileges and enjoyments of which either sex is susceptible.

Christianity would not have commended itself to every man's conscience had it not paid a due respect to all the natural and unavoidable relations existing in society. Hence there is not a *natural* relation to which it does not allude. Husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants, are all addressed in a way corresponding with the nature of these relations, well designed to sanctify and render them all useful, comfortable, and happy.

Here I am informed, by a note handed me, that I have omitted to say anything upon the subject of *regeneration*. Some persons think as most preachers speak. If you will observe, scarce a preacher takes a text, or makes a sermon, but he must give you his whole system of theology. No matter where the text be found, the system must come out. Hence some of this audience think, that, in defending christianity, I must defend or exhibit all the tenets of a sect, or all the essential points of some system; and so I am told that I have omitted the article of regeneration. Strange, indeed! when I have been discoursing at length upon the purifying influences of the christian religion, and its tendencies upon the hearts and lives of men, I should be told that I have neglected *the article of regeneration!* Perhaps my informant expected to hear from me a disquisition upon the quaint theories of modern systems. In not gratifying him with such a discussion, for the time being, I hope he will have the goodness to excuse me.

Having paid some attention to the genius, design, and tendency of christianity, I will now approach the *social system* again. Mr. Owen relies upon his twelve facts, and especially upon the sixth fact, or law, to demolish all the religions in the world. Yes, indeed, if his sixth law be a truism, he conceives that all the religions of the world are as prostrate as Dagon before the ark. If it be so, that we can neither make ourselves nor our wills, that circumstances control us by a necessity as unchangeable as fate itself, then he has proved, by merely asserting these laws, that all the religions of the world are founded upon the ignorance of mankind. He does not seem to have noticed

that there is a very learned and respectable body of christians who attribute as much to *necessity*, only under different names, as he does himself. Every action of every human being, is, with them, foreknown, and *predetermined* from all eternity; or in brief; "*that God has foreordained whatever comes to pass.*" Yet these are all firm and rational and argumentative believers in the Divine authority of these records. How, then, in the name of reason, can Mr. Owen think, that, in proving his doctrine of fate or necessity, he has proved all the religions in the world to be founded upon the ignorance of mankind, when he will find myriads of christians, philosophic or systematic necessarians, admitting his premises in all the prominent items, and yet dissenting from his conclusions?

It will not then follow, as a necessary consequence, in the mind of a thorough Calvinist, that if our volitions have no power over our belief, that if all things are unchangeably fixed, there is no truth in religion. Mr. Owen has taken for granted that which will not be granted by myriads of learned, acute, and talented men, that his propositions proved and christianity is slain. I hope he will not turn his thoughts thitherward. He may say that they are inconsistent, and self-condemned; but still it proves that his system may be true—myriads being judges.

But this only on the way to another peep into his theory. I do think, as Mr. Owen has paid so little attention to the objections offered to his system, that I am logically excused from paying any further attention to it. But as he still reiterates his fundamentals with undismayed confidence that the repetition of them is, like a charm, to effect a cure of our mental maladies; and as he has repeatedly affirmed that if one of his principles can be proved erroneous, he will give up the whole, I will call upon another witness in the case.

If consciousness be any sort of evidence of the powers with which we are endowed, I make the following appeal to it on the subject of his sixth law:

Objects are thrown in our way, or we go in quest of them.—These excite our reasoning powers, or call them into action. We reason upon them and form judgments. These judgments or conclusions either call for some activity upon our part, or they do not. If they do not, we do not act. But if they do, we act. Now what is the cause of these actions? Not the mere presentation of the object, but our reasonings upon it. From the first examination of the object to the last, there is a continual determination of the mind to the object or when we have finished the first examination of the object we will to examine it a second time; and so on to the third, or fourth examination. Mr. Owen, for example, had heard that the Mexican government had much territory to dispose of—his previous desire for territory to test his theory upon, prompts him to think upon some plan for obtaining a part of it. He reasons upon the object, and examines it in many independent points of view. On every separate view of the subject, he decides to examine it again. There are as

many determinations as examinations. Finally, his ultimate conclusion is formed. Now every one of these examinations is begun, prosecuted and carried out from the consciousness which he possesses of his power to accomplish the object so soon as it shall be decided which is the better course. He would never examine the subject a moment if he was not conscious that he has the power of examining it, and the power of acting agreeably to his last decision. Now this *consciousness* of the power of examination, deciding, and acting, I summon as proof that such a controlling power the mind possesses over its own acts. It is the nearest witness which can be summoned in this case, and its testimony is the most creditable. It knows most, and is the best judge, of all our intellectual and moral powers—and it avers, as every man can hear in the court of his own understanding, that nothing could be examined, contemplated, or reasoned upon, were we destitute of a controlling power, or a power of acting conformable to our own decisions. *Consciousness* is often the ultimate arbiter in all questions concerning our intellectual and moral powers. How often do we see persons either abandon or refuse to undertake a profession, or cause, because *conscious* their powers are not equal to it. We make consciousness a witness in all cases within its jurisdiction.

Again: in walking down street, Mr. Owen hears that his cotton factory at New Harmony is consumed by fire! he does not at first know whether the report is credible. He goes to the river to interrogate the passengers or captain of a steamboat just arrived from the vicinity. He interrogates them, and from their unanimous testimony he believes the fact, and doubts no more. Now would Mr. Owen have gone one step in this examination if he had not been conscious that he had the power of believing upon testimony, and that there was a certain amount of evidence which would produce certainty? His ultimate belief is evidently a consequence of the existence of this controlling power; and his determination to examine the matter proves that his volition had some influence upon his belief. For, had he not examined, he would not have believed; and had he not determined or willed to examine, he might not have obtained the evidence: so that his belief *is, in this case, dependent upon his will.*

Were I to ask him now to believe that his factory was not burned, he could not do it; not because his will determined anything about it, but because he wants evidence. Pretty much the same power which the will exercises over our eyes in examining objects of sense, does it exercise over our mental eye; we open or shut the eye in obedience to our wills. But we cannot will to see without light. An eye and light, and a will to see, are all necessary to vision. He that affirms that a man believes by necessity, may as well say that man sees by necessity. There is no person more blind than the man who will not see.

But we have still greater objections to the social system pleaded by

Mr. Owen. It is only in its best possible state founded upon the half of man, and only promises to make him a happy animal. For the sake of illustration, we will admit that Mr. Owen has consummated all his plans, and all his wishes, in erecting his parallelogram communities; and that he has got a whole territory, nay, the whole earth, covered with them—everything just to his mind. Man, at *his* zenith, is a stall-fed ox. Mr. Owen has mistaken the capacity of man as much as the vintner did the capacity of a vessel who strove to fill it with two gallons when it held four. Nothing but experiment could convince him; he thought his measure of two gallons was equal to the capacity of the vessel, until he poured in its contents: he then saw that it was but half full. So with Mr. Owen's system. Men would sigh, and groan, and long for greater bliss than Mr. Owen has to bestow. His wheat, his oil, and his wine; his amusements, pastimes, and all his *fanciful* inventions, would not fill the immeasurable blank yet remaining in the true enjoyment of rational beings, doomed by him only to riot like a worm upon the damask cheek of a deceased stripling.*

Man has taste, desires, aspirations after bliss higher than the earth can minister to him. Now if Mr. Owen contemplates man as other skeptics have done, not as a privileged being; if he would give him that latitude of licentious intercourse which prevails among the brutes in the gratification of every propensity, until his capacity for sensual enjoyment is filled to overflowing; if his artificial wants have been multiplied to the utmost conceivable extent; and if he have surrounded him with the most refined circumstances imaginable; what does it all amount to? Has he made him happy? Far from it. His capacity for happiness is as far from being filled as ever it was. It is only like subtracting a few miles from infinite space; the remainder is no less. So man's desires are as eager and as unsatisfied still. Like Alexander the Great when he had conquered the whole world, he wept, forsooth, because his arm was hampered, and had not room enough to do its work. "What a misfortune! Have I, indeed, no other world to conquer!"

Whence, then, this insatiable desire for happiness? or whence, as the poet says, "this longing after immortality?" Mr. Owen can boast, he says, that he is free from the fear of death; and he may boast that he is free from any hope in death. And so, like the well-fed calf, he has neither hope nor fear from death. Is this the glorious and rational end of this new philosophy? Let us eat and

---

*——————"Relentless fate forbids that we,
Through gay, voluptuous worlds should ever roam;
And were the fates more kind,
Our narrow luxuries would soon grow stale,
Were these exhaustless, nature would grow sick,
And tired of novelty—would squeamishly complain,
That all was vanity, and life a dream."

Armstrong's Art of Health.—Reporter.

drink, for to-morrow we die! But the time for adjournment has arrived.

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.

Mr. *Campbell* continues: Mr. Chairman—We concluded our remarks in the forenoon on the subject of the perfect inadequacy and mal-adaptation of my friend's scheme to the constitution of human nature—to the extent of our capacity of fruition. We admit, that, were the human family to be regarded as mere animals, whose enjoyments were all of a sensual kind, that Mr. Owen's scheme would not be liable to so much objection. We might conclude with Paul, "If there be no resurrection, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The short tenure of earthly enjoyments would compel us to make the best use of them, and indulge in them to the greatest extent. We might, then, adopt the Epicurean precept, "*Carpe diem*," and say with the Epicurean poet, "*Vita summa brevis vetat spem longam incohare.*" But inasmuch as reason and experience prove the inadequacy of all earthly pleasures to satisfy the human mind, we are obliged to declare that my friend's scheme falls infinitely short of providing for our capacity of enjoyment. Who so dead to the charms of the material universe as not to feel himself more refreshed and comforted by the sublime contemplation of the great Creator through his works, than ever he felt from mere sensual enjoyment? A small portion of material good things is sufficient to satisfy all the wants of nature; but the appetite for intellectual enjoyment is insatiable.

The construction of the material universe is admirably calculated to lead us to the contemplation of the great First Cause who created the heavens and their hosts, and who sustains the immense universe with more ease than we move a finger or an eyelid. To contemplate these things is "to look through nature up to nature's God." Shall this sublime pleasure be annihilated! Must we be forever doomed to look downward, and never raise our eyes to heaven! The splendors of the starry firmament, the glories hung up to human view in the majestic vault of heaven, are the natural types of the Divine Majesty; while the earth presents, in all its magazines of goodness and mercy, the plain drawn characters which interpret all these sublime symbols. Must we never read this volume, nor inquire into the moral character of its great Author! And do we not, my friends, find our only consolation under the toils, anxieties, and vexations of this troubled sea of life, in the anticipation of our one day reaching those mansions of peace, "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest?" Will any man's experience authorize him to say that when, like an ox, he has eaten and drank his fill, then he is happy? Certainly this would be to degrade man below the dignity of which he is now conscious. Who has been so successful and prosperous in the voyage of life as to gain the object of his pursuit? Does not almost every man die in the keen pursuit of his favorite object? And does not this teach us that all our acqui-

sitions are but progressions toward objects of distant fruition and hope? Experience teaches us that our capacity of happiness is not to be filled by sublunary pleasures; that earth and sea, with all their treasures, are far too small to fill the soul of man.

This social system robs the disconsolate of their only support — drives them to the adoption of Mirabaud's seductive cure; and when "weary of conjecture" concerning futurity, to put an end to the debate with a knife, a halter, or a pistol. Were it not for the cheering consolation which the hope of immortality inspires, what numerous suicides should we have to deplore! This hope is not only necessary to fill the measure of our capacity of enjoyment, but it is necessary that we should carefully cherish this bright hope that we may be enabled to sustain the vicissitudes, the disasters, the moral and physical diseases, which attach to our bankrupt circumstances. Experience has proved to us all, that we have derived more pleasure from the pursuit of a favorite object, than we have enjoyed in the attainment of it; that we derive more pleasure from anticipating future gains, than in realizing them. Cut off anticipation from man, and you sever him from the most fruitful source of his happiness. The pursuit, more than the acquisition, all experience says, contributes to please, amuse, and gratify man. To place man, then, in a situation where he has nothing to wish for, nothing to desire, nor to pursue, is to cut him off from this most fruitful source of intellectual pleasure, which all men have found to be paramount to all sensual gratifications. But not only in this instance is the theory contradicted by the universal experience of mankind—but it also involves another mistake in regard to the constitution of human nature.

Mr. Owen contends that a society can exist without an idea of obligation or responsibility. This is contrary to all the past records of time, and all present experience. A *banditti* of highway robbers could not exist without the ligament of laws, and the tie of moral obligation. Without them it would be impossible for them to concert a scheme of co-operative plunder.

> "For not since Adam wore his verdant apron,
> Has man with man in social union dwelt;
> But laws were made to draw that union closer."—Scott.

No society has ever existed, or ever can exist, without some sense of responsibility and obligation. We talk of a *lawless banditti*, but this is to be understood *sub modo*. They are not without laws, and rigorous ones, too, among themselves; they well know that they could not exist without them.

It is worthy of notice here, that among the rabble of superstitions, professed by the pagan world, not one of them ever pretended to be derived from the First Cause. They derived their religious systems from subordinate persons, from inferior deities, who stood in some special relation to the people that adored them. The ancients ascertained that it was impossible to retain men in order without the

influence of religious restraints. The popular religions of the pagan world were all founded upon this principle; and magistrates imposed religions upon the people which they did not believe themselves, because experience had taught them that man was not to be governed without religious restraints. The ancient philosophers saw through the cheat, and were sufficiently inclined to expose it. Some of them denied the existence of future rewards and punishments. They contended that the body must return to the earth, and the spirit to the Universal Spirit, of which it was but an emanation, and that therefore future punishment was impossible. But the magistracy told the philosophers that, although all this might be very true, yet the people were not to be kept in order without the restraints of religion; and the philosophers were strictly enjoined not to propagate their free-thinking notions among the vulgar. From this originated the Elusinian, and other mysteries of antiquity, the object of which was to preserve among the initiated, just views of the First Cause, and of the gods worshiped by the vulgar, which dare not be divulged among them. If we examine the ancient superstitions of the pagan world, we shall find them all founded upon this politic hypothesis.

No social compact has as yet existed without the doctrine of responsibility, obligation, or accountability. Mr. Owen's scheme is the most Utopian project in the annals of society. He lays the ax at the root of all obligation and accountability, and yet would have society to hang together without a single attraction, save animal magnetism, if such a thing exists. The doctrine of *no praise, no blame*, is to be taught from the cradle to the grave; and yet all are to live in accordance with the most virtuous principles. They are to have no principle of responsibility suggested; and yet under the charm of social feeling alone, they are to be more firmly bound than any wedded pair! Among the visions of the wildest enthusiasm, this one appears to be a rarity.

Children are to be reared without a lesson upon obligation or duty, and yet they are to be most orderly, neither selfish, querulous, peevish, ambitious, nor any way vicious. All these evil propensities are to be eradicated from their nature in consequence of being born in chambers ventilated, heated, or refrigerated in the social way. They are to be models of beauty and rationality too, by a mere change of circumstances. No irrational faces, no deformed countenances, no disfigured frames can grow in any of Mr. Owen's parallelogram arrangements. The romantic genius of Mr. Owen gives these babes all angelic charms, excepting wings; and while there is to be a total destitution of all evil disposition, they are to be perfect giants in literature, virtue, and benevolent enterprise — able in two hours per diem, to provide for all their own happiness and to perpetuate overflowing streams of bliss to posterity!

I am yet at a loss to know what Mr. Owen means by *society*. A society without a social compact, to me is unintelligible. Society is not a number of persons covering a certain piece of ground like the

trees in our forests. They must congregate upon some stipulations, express or implied. These stipulations are to be performed, and consequently, responsibility and accountability forces itself upon Mr. Owen in defiance of the powers of his imagination. In all other societies, except Mr. Owen's imaginary one, the people and the magistracy, whether elective or hereditary, are mutually accountable to each other. The people owe *allegiance*, which they promise in electing their rulers; and the magistracy owe *protection* which they promised in being elected. In entering into society man surrenders a part of his natural liberty for other benefits, which he could not enjoy as a hermit. This surrender he must never recall, nor those benefits must they withhold: they are, therefore, under continual obligations to each other. Whenever any person feels himself absolved from these obligations, he is either dangerous to, or unfit for, society. And certainly Mr. Owen's system of training children would naturally lead them to feel themselves absolved from all such obligations. His system directly unfits them for society. I would ask you, my friends, or I would ask him, in what light he could contemplate that society which taught every child that entered its schools, that the child which would kill its own father was not to be blamed or disliked any more than the child which loved, caressed, and reverenced its father?

But, to be a little more plain and pointed, I must again remind you that Mr. Owen's system, as far as it has any peculiar benevolence proposed in it, or stamped upon it, is a plagiarism from christian society; in other words, all the benevolence about it was derived from models furnished by christian enterprise and christian sympathy, and the crude notions of materialism and philosophic necessity, have been superadded from the atheistical schools of France and Epicurus. The influence of parents over their offspring, and the influence of circumstances, were popular doctrines in the reign of king Solomon; nay, in the days of Moses. Moses laid as much emphasis upon the necessity of bringing up children under the best moral influences as any man in ancient or modern times. And so great an adept was Solomon in this science, that he affirmed: "Train up a child in the way it should live, and when old it will not depart from it." Mr. Owen, indeed, has confessed that he was indebted to christian society for his first ideas of the cooperative system in producing the greatest amount of human enjoyment, as far as our temporal wants are concerned. Mr. Owen may have had the merit of amplifying somewhat upon the data furnished by the excellent *preacher*, Mr. Dale. The advantages accruing from the experiments of Mr. Dale were sufficient to convince any person of Mr. Owen's discernment, that much might be done by benevolent cooperation in a population like that in Scotland, to diminish the evils under which a large class groan from poverty, and its handmaid, ignorance. This was the start of the benevolent part of the scheme.

About forty years ago, when my friend was just about entering

manhood's prime, the French revolution broke out, and all the covert deism, atheism, and skepticism, which the vices of popery had generated like worms in a putrid carcass, exhibited themselves. Kingcraft and priestcraft became odious all at once, and infidelity, rising in the greatness of its feebleness, or strength, shook itself clean of both crafts, and ignorantly and impiously attempted to deify matter, and dethrone the legitimate sovereign of the universe. The ravages of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, began to appear in all their horrors. Priests were now everywhere execrated, caricatured, and every printer's shop was filled with infidel and atheistical tracts. In this awful crisis, when atheism became philosophy, and skepticism was called reason, every raw and undisciplined mind who came into contact with these spirits or their works, caught the contagion: and the desire of being reputed a philosopher, or a man of reason, impelled them to laugh at religion, as if it deserved no better treatment than the Puritans once thought was due to witches and necromancers. The contagion spread into England, and the woeful circumstances which then surrounded my friend furnished him with the first impulses or data for the infidel part of his scheme. Since then he has been laboring to amalgamate the good ideas received by the better part of his circumstances with the bad ideas derived from the worse part of them; and it is owing to the superiority of his natural organization that he has been so moral, or that his atheism has not led him into the usual and legitimate results which have, in ninety-nine instances in every hundred, been its attendants.

But beside the models furnished him in Scotland, the Moravian and other societies, either preaching or practicing some sort of a religious community of interests and feelings, either strengthened the convictions or enlarged the views of my benevolent friend. But the misfortune was, and is (and I fear will be), that he persists in attempting to unite the lights of christianity with the darkness of skepticism. But the greatest error which I have to attribute to Mr. Owen is, his not discriminating what Dr. Franklin failed to teach Thomas Paine. This political philosopher, who was, like many other reasoners, *sane in politics*, but *insane in religion*, submitted his "Age of Reason" to the revision or inspection of the greatest American philosopher. He read it, and agreeably to Mr. Paine's request, he wrote him his advice about its publication. After telling the skeptic what risks he would incur, and how little good his work would do, he gravely reminds him how much he was indebted for those principles of morality and benevolence which he possessed, to the influence and genius of the religion he was about to attack. He tells him that he calculates too largely upon the natural virtues of man. This advice of the American sage applies with still additional force to Mr. Owen. He possesses a most benevolent temperament. In early life, too, he went regularly to church; and from these sources, as from the "good books" which he told you he had read, he imbibed all these morali-

ties and benevolent views which his skepticism has not in forty years been able to obliterate. But his fault (for I believe that men may be guilty of faults) has been not to discriminate, not to assign to its proper cause the influences which he feels, and which he sees in himself and in the world.

His ideas concerning matrimony, and many of his views, detailed in this discussion, were all detailed with much ability by Godwin in his Political Justice, though he feared some of those conclusions from his own premises, which Mr. Owen has had the moral courage to avow. I do not say that Mr. Owen directly and literally borrowed all his ideas from these fountains; but as these were not only the fashionable books, but the common topics of the epoch of his social system; and as he has told us that he has *read five hours per day for nearly thirty years of his life*, it would be doing him injustice to suppose that these works had not occupied a due share of his attention.

I am not so skeptical in skepticism as Mr. Owen is in christianity, or, as to think that mankind may not be improved in their condition. "*Fas est ab hoste discere.*" It is lawful to learn from an enemy. I do not doubt but that Mr. Owen has asserted many truths, and some useful truths. But not one good idea has he submitted, which has not been derived, or which is not derivable from christianity. There was a society in the New Testament which had all things in common; but their happiness was not derived from a community of goods, but from that principle which issued, in their circumstances, in a community of goods. I most sanguinely anticipate a restoration of the ancient order of things, and a state of society far superior to anything yet exhibited on earth. I believe that there will be what is commonly believed by all christians, a Millennium; a period, a long period of general or universal peace, happiness, and political and religious prosperity. And that some of the views of Mr. Owen may then be realized as the legitimate fruits of christianity, I would not deny.

But I must speak plainly and say, taking the whole of Mr. Owen's theory in the mass, it is the most visionary theory which has ever been pronounced. It is, too, all *theory*, for Mr. Owen has not made a single proof of it. He cannot point to any society, on earth, as a practical proof of its practicability, or of its excellency. Tell me nothing about New Lanark, for there it has never been tested: and tell me nothing about New Harmony, for there, Mr. Owen will not appeal himself. He has given us a beautiful theory of his social system. But Paul Brown's "Twelve months' residence in New Harmony" will show the thing in practice ['*tis all a lie, says Mr. Owen*]. And although much has been said about New Lanark, I must, if testimony be a proper source of information, believe that no social system, no co-operative system, was ever tried there. That many persons may there have been improved in their circumstances is not denied. But how has that come to pass? — not on the principles

which Mr. Owen now teaches. I will tell you how some of them have been reformed and improved in their circumstances in that establishment. If, for example, a drunkard was received into the New Lanark manufactories, he was not permitted to draw any money from this company, for his work, so long as he continued in the employment of the company. All his necessary demands for food, raiment, lodging, etc., were promptly paid in the articles wanted; and the surplus, if any there was, was not paid him in money, during his continuance in the establishment; but when he removed, the last farthing was paid him. Thus he became sober from necessity; and temperate, because he could not get anything to intoxicate him. The prodigal, and those destitute of economy were improved in their finances by this same system—and there was a good school for educating the youth, for which, I believe, Mr. Owen deserves some praise. But this is about the nett proceeds of the social system in New Lanark. The people of New Lanark, too, were, in the aggregate, a *religious* people. There is one Presbyterian church in New Lanark, well frequented; also for the benefit of the Independents, who dissented from the establishment, a meeting-house was built, to which Mr. Owen himself was the principal contributor. For, to his credit, it must be told, that while he has been declaiming against priests and their impositions, he has been liberal in building meeting-houses. The people of New Lanark are a religious people. I have learned, from those who visited that place, that not only on the first day of the week, but on Thursdays, and other stated meetings during the week, they meet for social worship in some of the large rooms of the establishment.

Mr. Owen's theory, then, is without proof, unknown, and incredible. Forty years' reading, studying, traveling, and all the funds expended, have produced nothing as yet visible, except the "*Twelve fundamental Divine laws of human nature.*" "Like quicksilver, the rhetoric he displays, shines as it runs, but grasped at, slips away." New Harmony was once the land of promise. Bankrupt and broken fortunes were to be repaired there. Thither came the lame, the halt, the blind, in fortune and in fame. The philosopher's stone, or the elixir of immortal youth, were not more eagerly sought than the city of Mental Independence. But soon the charm dissolved, and all the awful realities of nature, reason, and religion, disbanded the social builders, and like those in the plains of Shinar, when one called for a brick, his attendant handed him a stone, or a blow, and utter dispersion and confusion on their banners waited. As many of these folks as had been brought to their senses, and had ever read Horace, as they returned, admitted the truth of the old maxim, and now and then lisped it out:

> "Cœlum non animum mutant,
> Qui trans mare currunt."—HORACE.
> Their clime, and not their mind, they change,
> Who sail across the sea.

The trinity of evils was the text for months at New Harmony. But soon they found a treble trinity of other evils than artificial ones. Next to religion, marriage was accursed. Marriage, the oldest institution in the world, founded in nature, reason, and religion, must be banished the dominions of the social system. It enabled parents to recognize their children, and children their parents; and natural affection would run in these channels, and *mine* and *thine*, in spite of the twelve categories would be heard, and all this was perfect *discord* in the music of New *Harmony*. Marriage, then, must, for these reasons, be banished, that a thorough *social* system may succeed.

This attempt to dissolve, violate, or impugn the marriage contract, I think, ruined the project on the Wabash. It is hard to fight against "the trinity of nature, reason, and religion." God said, it is not good for man to be alone! He then created a helpmate for him. Even in paradise, man alone was but half blessed:

> "The world was sad, the garden was a wild,
> And man the hermit sigh'd, till woman smil'd."—*Reporter.*

Polygamy was denounced in the creation of but one woman for man, and the equal distribution of the sexes since has shown, that every man ought to have his own wife, and every woman her own husband. All that adorns, animates, and exalts, as respects the finer feelings of human nature, spring from this institution in its primitive appointment. On the altar of matrimony are woven all the cords of affection, all the ligaments and bands that cement society. All natural relations are but the names of the silken cords which bind society in all the social relations which give a zest to all enjoyments, and extract the sting from the thousand griefs and sorrows of human life. He that would abolish this institution, or violate its sacred obligations, is anything but a philanthropist. Destroy this institution, and not only the happiness of man, as a social being, but the safety of the race, would be endangered. Parental affection is the strongest passion of the human soul, which not even the deformity of person or mind, or filial ingratitude, disobedience, or impiety, can wholly obliterate. Our greatest gratifications, on earth, arise from this institution, and the relations to which it gives birth. And it is just as necessary for the safety, as for the happiness of the race.*

But to meet the exigencies of the new state of existence, when marriage is to be no more, a band of nurses are to be trained who are to have in charge the infants of the communities. This is to save time and labor, and to economize the *productive* energies of the communities. Mothers are thus to be happily exempted from many

* This is contended for, by Montesquieu, in his Spirit of Laws; but he goes farther; he contends that without the institution of marriage, children would never reach maturity; and hence is derived the legal maxim.

"*Pater est quem mutiae demonstrant.*"—*Reporter.*

of the toils incident to parturition; and in this arrangement Mr. Owen supposes he is promoting the happiness of mothers. This is a lame and blind philosophy. A mother feels incomparably more pleasure in having the care of her own offspring, than in being exempt from it. The smiles of her infant, the opening dawn of reason, the indications of future greatness or goodness, as they exhibit themselves to her sanguine expectations, open to her sources of enjoyment incomparably overpaying the solicitudes and gentle toils of nursing. In exempting her from the natural concern and care due to her offspring, Mr. Owen debars her from the largest portion of maternal enjoyments, for which he can substitute nothing like an equivalent. But, perhaps, when marriage is abolished, all maternal solicitudes and enjoyments will expire with it. Indeed, all the finer and more tender sensibilities of our nature appear to share the same fate in the desolating prospects of the new order of things, for the luxury of eating and drinking. The most powerful* of all natural affections is to be waylaid in the cradle; and, if possible, slaughtered as soon as born--the affection of parents for children flowing from the sacred institution of marriage. In every point of view in which we regard it, this system is at war with human nature, as well as with religion, matrimony, and private property. It aims a mortal blow at all our ideas of social order and social happiness. But Mr. Owen has not yet found, and I am confident he will never find, human nature and human passions so plastic as to be cast into any artificial mould he may imagine; sooner will he cause the rivers to flow backward to their sources; sooner can he reverse the decrees of gravitation, than abolish religion, marriage, or even private property. I doubt not either, that were men as religious as christianity is designed to make them, they could co-operate in societies greatly to diminish the evils of life, to facilitate the education of their children, and to augment their social enjoyments. But to attempt this without the aids, the principles, motives, and inspirations of christianity, would be only to attempt to make a globe, a new earth, without the principle of gravitation or attraction. Mr. Owen's system always appears to me to resemble the efforts of some pagan god to build a world upon the single principle of repulsion.

But Mr. Owen is about to have the animal man improved as the horses and sheep of this country have been improved, upon *scientific* principles. He has told us of a science, in which he is an adept, and with which all shall be well acquainted in "the new state of existence," for improving man in his animal and mental endowments,

---

* So sensible was the old common law of England of this point, that it made the workings of parental affection a palliation for the commission of *murder*. For when a man's son was severely beaten by another boy, and came home and told his father, if his father went in pursuit of the other boy, and followed him *one mile* before he overtook him, and beat him in return, so that he died; this was held by all the judges to be only *manslaughter*, in consideration of the strength of natural feelings.—*Reporter.*

even from, if not *anterior* to, his birth. This is all in accordance with the fine imagination of my friend. He is not, however, the inventor of this part of his scheme; Dr. Graham was before him, and disrobed him of the honor of originating even this part of the new sciences of the social system. We shall give you some short account of this matter.

James Graham, M. D., born at Edinburgh, 1745, a philanthropic physician, traveled over great part of England and America, administering relief in the most desperate cases, for the benefit of mankind. After returning from America, where he had realized a considerable fortune, he settled in London, about 1775. There, under the titles of a Temple of Hymen and a Temple of Health, he erected one of the most superb institutions that ever was planned, for the gratification of the votaries of pleasure; and, under the pretense of instructing all persons of both sexes who put themselves under his tuition, and were willing to sacrifice to Venus in these sacred domes, he engaged to teach "the art of preventing barrenness, and of propagating a much more strong, beautiful, active, healthy, wise, and virtuous race of human beings, than the present puny, insignificant, foolish, peevish, vicious, and nonsensical race of christians; who quarrel, fight, bite, devour, and cut one another's throats about they know not what." Such is a part of one of his many advertisements which then appeared in the London papers.

About the end of 1787, he returned to Edinburgh in a new and extraordinary character, viz: that of a teacher sent from God, to announce the millennium, the second coming of Christ, and the final consummation of all things. He styled himself the servant of the Lord, O. W. L., *i. e.*, as he explained it, Oh Wonderful Love. He commenced a new era, dating his bills "1st, 2d, and 3d days of the first month of the New Jerusalem." But before the commencement of the second month he was constrained to confess "he felt the devil, the world, and the flesh too strong for him, and therefore he supposed the Lord must look out for another forerunner of his second coming."

During a great part of this time his wife (for he had married in New England) seems to have been neglected, and even forgotten; for, upon becoming acquainted with the celebrated Mrs. Macauley, the historian, he offered her his hand, which she would have accepted had she not accidentally discovered that he had a wife still living. Upon this discovery, the Doctor, nowise discomfited, protested the ardor of his passion for her had made him forget that *circumstance*. This singular and benevolent being died in 1794.

The points of similarity between my friend and the Doctor are so plain, that I need not be at the pains to point them out. Your own recollection of the first and second years of the era of Mental Independence proclaimed at the metropolis of Free Thinkers, and at the head of the army of the "March of Mind," will, with what you have heard and seen on the present occasion, be sufficient data to

trace the lineaments of Dr. Graham in my good-natured and benevolent friend.

I forgot to mention that Dr. Graham was finally placed in a lunatic asylum. But on this side of this extravagance, several miles on this side of these enthusiastic flights, there have been schemes hatched up under the canopy of a peculiar organization, as air-built it is true, and as benevolent as that of Dr. Graham and Mr. Owen, which have lasted a little longer, but have finally proved as empty quite.

But, my friends, I should not have occupied a minute of your time upon these visions, and dreams, and theories, called philosophic or vulgar, had it not been for the wanton attack made by Mr. Owen on the last, best hope of mortal man. I should have permitted any other experiment to have found its quietus, as thousands such have already done, without observation or regard. But when I see the last hope of a dying world recklessly assaulted, I feel too much interest in the eternal welfare of my fellow-creatures, to remain a mere passive spectator. I feel myself called upon to put on the armor of reason, true philosophy, and religion, and to stand to my post, lest in the midst of such morbid excitements, in this age of extravagant theory and licentious philosophy, many over-ardent minds might be allured by the speciousness and false glare of this tinseled philosophy, which, I trust, we have shown to be anything else but consentaneous with the constitution, experience, and history of the world.

Behold the cruelty of this scheme! (not that Mr. Owen is cruel), the hard-heartedness of the system! Think of all the labors and toils, the griefs and sorrows through which you have passed. How have you wearied yourselves in pursuit of phantoms. Everything you have gained has only mocked and disappointed you. Like bubbles they have bursted when you laid your hands upon the glistening objects of your avarice or ambition. All has been fleeting and evanescent. You know, for woeful experience has taught you, that you have been pursuing shadows. What pleased you at seven, you disdained at fourteen; what charmed you at fourteen, was disgusting at twenty; and what you almost adored at twenty, has been long since contemned and despised; and what now fascinates you at forty, will, should you reach seventy, appear as unworthy of your admiration as the toys of childhood now present themselves to you. But when the curtain drops, and the last grand act of the drama of human life closes, you will be mocked still; and, on Mr. Owen's principle, you have been mocked at last. There is nothing real. You desired immortality; you sought it, each in his own way; but with him none have found it. It is deceit and mockery all through. Riches, popularity, wisdom, health, and life itself, have all been deceivers—all was promise—all is disappointment. The promised bliss, the real, substantial, and permanent good which religion has presented to you, is torn from your eyes, and everlasting death, eternal sleep,

and utter annihilation, is the only reality he has offered you. Cruel system! Bootless boast!

Religion—the Bible! What treasures untold reside in that heavenly word! Religion has given *meaning*, design, to all that is past, and is, as the moral to the fable, the good, the only good of the whole—the earnest now of an abundant harvest of future and eternal good. Now let me ask the living before me, for we cannot yet appeal to the dead, whence has been derived your most rapturous delights on earth? Have not the tears, the dew of religion in the soul, afforded you incomparably more joy than all the fleshly gayeties, than all the splendid vanities, than the loud laugh and the festive song of the sons and daughters of the flesh. Even the alternations of hope and fear, of joy and sorrow, of which the christian may be conscious, in his ardent race after a glorious immortality, afford more true bliss than ever did the sparkling gems, the radiant crown, or the triumphal arch, bestowed by the gratitude or admiration of a nation, on some favorite child of fortune and of fame.

Whatever comes from religion, comes from God. The greatest joys derivable to mortal man come from this source. I cannot speak for all who wear the christian name; but for myself I must say, that worlds piled on worlds to fill the universal scope of my imagination, would be a miserable per contra, against the annihilation of the idea of God the Supreme. And the paradox of paradoxes, the miracle of miracles, and the mystery of mysteries with me now, was, and evermore shall be, is, *how any good man could wish there was no God!* With the idea of God the Almighty departs from this earth not only the idea of virtue, or moral excellence, but of all rational enjoyment. What is height without top; depth without bottom; length and breadth without limitation? What is the sublimity of the universe without the idea of Him who created, balances, sustains, and fills the whole with goodness? The hope of one day seeing this Wonderful One, of beholding Him that made my body, and is the Father of my spirit; the anticipation of being introduced into the palace of the universe, the sanctuary of the heavens, transcends all comparison with all sublunary things. Our powers of conception, of imagination, and our powers of computation and expression, are alike baffled and prostrated in such an attempt.

Take away this hope from me, and teach me to think that I am the creature of mere chance, and to it alone indebted for all that I am, was, and ever will be, and I see nothing in the universe but mortification and disappointment; death is as desirable as life; and no one creature or thing is more deserving of my attention or consideration than another. But if so much pleasure be derived from surveying the face of nature—from contemplating the heavens and the systems of astronomy; if there be so much exquisite enjoyment from peeping into the great laboratory of nature, and in looking into the delicate touches, the great art, the wonderful design even in the smaller works, in the kingdom which the microscope opens to

our view, what will be the pleasure, the exquisite joy, in seeing and beholding him who is the *Fountain of Life*, the Author and Artificer of the whole Universe. But the natural and physical excellencies, and material glories of this fabric, are but, as it were, the substratum, from which shine all the moral glories of the Author of *Eternal Life*, and the august scheme which gives immortality to man!

No unrestrained freedom to explore the penetralia of voluptuousness, to revel in all the luxury of worms, to bask in the ephemeral glories of a sunbeam, can compensate for the immense robbery of the idea of God and the hope of deathless bliss. Dreadful adventure! hazardous experiment! most ruinous project! to blast the idea of God! The worst thing in such a scheme which could happen, or even appear to happen, would be success. But as well might Mr. Owen attempt to fetter the sea, to lock up the winds, to prevent the rising of the sun, as to exile this idea from the human race. For although man has not, circumstanced as he now is, unaided by revelation, the power to originate such an idea; yet when it is once suggested to a child, it never can be forgotten. As soon could a child annihilate the earth, as to annihilate the idea of God once suggested. The proofs of his existence become as numerous as the drops of dew from the womb of the morning—as innumerable as the blades of grass produced by the renovating influences of spring; everything within us and everything without, from the nails upon the ends of our fingers, to the sun, moon, and stars, confirm the idea of his existence and adorable excellencies. To call upon a rational being to prove the being and perfections of God, is like asking a man to prove that he exists himself. What! shall a man be called upon to prove *a priori*, or *a posteriori*, that there is one great Fountain of Life! a Universal Creator! If the millions of millions of witnesses which speak for him in heaven, earth, and sea, will not be heard, the feeble voice of man will be heard in vain.

Some questions have been handed me to-day which do not come within the lawful purview of this discussion. They are of a sectarian character, and, therefore, we cannot attend to them at this time, however agreeable it might be for us on some other occasion to attend to them.

The question, *What is the Word of God?* has already been anticipated in my remarks upon what constitutes *revelation*. In the Bible, we have seen, are the revelations of God; but, beside these, much of the history of the world. The discriminations already laid down on this subject are, we presume, sufficiently plain to enable all to form a correct decision upon this subject.

That which is emphatically called *the Word of God*, *the Word of the Lord*, or *the Word*, in the New Testament, is generally, if not exclusively, the Gospel, or Good News concerning Jesus Christ. Of the many proofs of this, I will give you but one at present, and then conclude: Peter had the honor of making the first clear, explicit and

correct confession of *the faith* ever made upon earth. When all the Apostles were interrogated by the Lord in his own person concerning their views of himself, Peter thus spoke: "*We believe and are sure that* THOU ART THE MESSIAH, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD." This drew the blessing of the Savior upon the head of Peter, and obtained him the honor of *the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* By this figure was meant, that Peter should have the honor of opening the gates of the kingdom of heaven, or the *new reign* announced by John the Baptist, the Savior, the twelve Apostles, and the seventy disciples, as near at hand, or as approaching. These keys have been long a bone of contention among the clergy. The Pope says he wears them at his girdle; the archbishops of York and Canterbury think they have them in joint keeping; the good old Kirk of Scotland thinks she has them in the archives of her General Assembly; and Independents think each congregation, or an association of congregations have them in charge. But, as we have no account of them in the last will and testament of the Apostle Peter, we have no good reason to conclude that he made any, or all, of these good ecclesiastics the *keepers of the keys.* Beside, I do not know that we have any use for them. Peter opened that kingdom of which they were the keys to the Jews and proselytes in Jerusalem upon the ever-memorable Pentecost. And some years afterward, when God designed to call the Gentiles into the kingdom, much pains were taken to obtain Peter. He was sent for to Joppa, and came to Cesarea, and opened the kingdom to the Gentiles. The gates of this kingdom have never since been locked against Jew or Gentile—against none but the impenitent and unbelieving; and Peter declared once already that he could not open the kingdom to such. But having once opened the kingdom, and never having locked it, he took the keys with him; and so it is all an idle controversy about the keys: none of them, none of us, have them.

But my special object in introducing this occurrence is to show how Peter, when opening the reign of favor in Jerusalem and Cesarea, defined *the Word of God,* or THE WORD. In opening the kingdom of heaven, or that new state of society and privilege, of which the Savior spoke to Nicodemus, when he told him, "*Except a man were born of water and the Spirit, into the kingdom of God he could not enter,*" Peter narrated the deeds, and mission, and death, and resurrection of Jesus; and showed the Jews how they might be born of water and the Spirit, and thus enter the kingdom. He did so also in Cesarea. He defined the message, or proclamation, in this way: "That *word,* or message, which God sent by Jesus Christ, you have, no doubt, heard the report of; how it was proclaimed by John concerning the mission of Jesus, who did so and so. To him," said he, "did all the prophets testify, that whosoever believeth in him might obtain remission of sins." They were born of the Spirit and of water too; and, moreover, received the miraculous powers of the Holy Spirit. Thus Peter defined *the Word of God.* And this is now

emphatically *the Word of the Lord*, or *the Word of God*, to which, my friends, we ought, one and all, to pay supreme regard.

We rejoice that *the Word* of God is well defined in this volume, and most easily distinguished, not only from all former communications of the Almighty, but from all other information found in the sacred records. They who presumed to make criticism upon the terms and phrases found in the Bible, ought first to ascertain well whether they are biblical critics.

I should now proceed to give you a concentrated view of the whole argument, but I must give place to my friend, that he may make his objections to my long speech.

[The above speech commenced on Friday at three o'clock, and, in all, occupied twelve hours.]

MR. OWEN'S TWENTY-THIRD ADDRESS.

It is my wish to make the present meeting, which is a very singular one in its nature, as extensively beneficial as possible. After the full statement of my views, with which I opened this discussion, it was not my intention to occupy much of your time in listening to a rejoinder to Mr. Campbell. But not knowing what my friend was going to say in answer to that statement, and finding that, instead of replying to my arguments, he has given you a full and elaborate development of the christian religion, it is necessary to detain you somewhat longer than I intended.

I have listened to Mr. C. with profound attention; and have, therefore, received the impressions which his elaborate expositions of the christian system and his whole chain of evidence are capable of producing on a mind long accustomed to severe and accurate reasoning. I now owe it to you who have attended here so patiently through this discussion—I owe it to the present generation, and to all future generations—to declare, without reserve, what these impressions are.

My friend, Mr. Campbell, appears to me to have done his duty manfully, and with a zeal that would have been creditable to any of the primitive fathers of the church. His own conviction of the truth and divine origin of the system which he advocates, and his ardent desire to impress that conviction upon my mind, and upon yours, all here have witnessed. His learning, his industry, and some very extraordinary talents for supporting the cause which he advocates, have been conspicuous; and for one trained in the *fiery* notions produced by the free-will doctrines, he has restrained his temper beyond my most sanguine expectations. That, however, which I admire in him above all, is his downright honesty and fairness in what he believes to be the cause of truth. He says to his opponent: "I am strong in the cause I advocate: it is from heaven; and I fear not what man can do against it. I am ready to meet you at any time and place, provided I may reply to you, and that our arguments shall go together to the public, to pass its ordeal, and await its ulti-

mate calm decision." Now, this is a straight-forward proceeding in the investigation of truth which I have long sought for, but which, until now, I have sought for in vain. The friends of truth, therefore, on whichever side of the question it may be found, are now more indebted to Mr. Campbell than any other christian minister of the present day.

These are the impressions made upon my mind with regard to my friend Mr. Campbell's conduct in this delicate and difficult task which he has volunteered to perform. It is now my duty to give you the living impressions which Mr. Campbell's learning, industry and zeal have made upon my mind, through the long discussion we have heard. And you will not, I trust, imagine that what I am about to state proceeds from *any other cause than the love of truth, and a sincere desire to benefit the present and future generations.*

Then, my friends, my impressions are, that christianity is *not* of divine origin; that it is *not* true; and that its doctrines are now anything but beneficial to mankind. On the contrary, my impressions are deeply confirmed, that its miracles and mysteries are of man's contrivance, to impose on the great mass of mankind, who have never yet been taught to reason; to enable the few to govern the many, through their interested hopes and fears for the future; and to induce the many to prostrate their minds before an order of men, who, through these means, can easily keep them in subjection to the powers that be. That its doctrines are now, by turning aside the mind from investigating its own powers, the only obstacle in christendom to the most important improvements; and that the whole system, in its principles and practice, in despite of all we have heard in advocating it, is the greatest bar to the progress of knowledge, that now exists; and that, if my impressions are right, christianity, as it is now taught all over christendom, by preventing man from acquiring an accurate knowledge of himself, or of the only means by which his character can be uniformly well formed, is the greatest curse with which our race is at this time afflicted.

My friends, do you suppose that I could utter such a sentiment as you have now heard, lightly and without due consideration? No! it is the settled conviction of my mind, arising from forty years of the greatest possible industry in tracing christianity, in all its influences and operations upon the whole of society.

There is no individual in this assembly, who regrets the necessity of wounding your feelings more than I do. But, my friends, I am not speaking for the hour, or the day, or the few hundreds that are here. I speak to you a truth, which I expect, when once promulgated, will pass from mind to mind, until it shall pervade every part of the world. I speak to you a truth, which, whatever may be your present impressions, will, one day, prove to you the most valuable truth you ever heard.

My friends, would you not suppose, from what you have heard of the practical advantages of christianity, that all is now right among

you ; that you are very angels in conduct ; that you have among you the very perfection of virtue and all excellence ? But you all well know this is not the case. You well know that christian society, all over christendom, abounds in vice and iniquity. [*Here there was some stir among the audience.*] My friends, if any of you are afraid to hear the truth, it is time for you to depart. [*Here a little more excitement, and some few left the church.**]

My friends, when the Jewish system was worn out, and the time had arrived for another to be introduced, the excitement which took place, when communications were publicly made, that a new order of things was about to commence, was much greater than the trifling movement which we have just now witnessed. The time, however, has arrived, when the corruptions of the christian system, like the corruptions of all preceding and existing old systems, call loudly for a great and mighty moral change. Do not you all acknowledge daily, and with great truth, that you are now dead in trespasses and sins ? If you really mean what you say, it is high time that you should arise under new circumstances into new life. But unless the truth, without any fear of man, shall be honestly spoken to you, what help is there for you ? You have not, in this discussion, heard from me one syllable that is not deeply fixed in my mind as a valuable truth; nor, during the remainder of these proceedings, shall you hear a word from me, that is not dictated by an ardent desire to place without disguise the most valuable truths before you.

The evidences which Mr. Campbell has brought to prove the truth of Christianity, prove to me its falsehood. And all he has said about the purity of its doctrines, and their efficacy for practice, is disproved by the daily conduct of every christian population in every quarter of the world.

A christian population is, emphatically, in practice, a population preying upon each other, and living very generally in a state of unnatural anxiety, or useless and surplus property, in the midst of hourly deception and hypocrisy ; hating and disliking each other because they cannot think and feel alike, having been taught the notion that they may think and feel as they please. It is everywhere a population of inequality of condition, and, necessarily, of pride, poverty, envy, and jealousy. It is a population in which tenfold more of exertion and anxiety is required from each, to produce the misery they experience, than is necessary to secure a full supply of the best of everything for all. In short, I find it to be, in practice, so full of ignorance, weakness, insincerity, and counteraction of each other's views and objects, and of weekly preaching to perpetuate all these evils, that did I not firmly believe that truth is omnipotent to remove error, and that we are, in consequence, rapidly approaching a new state of existence, in which, with regard to these things, there will be a new birth and a new life, a regeneration that will purge man from

* Here a lady almost fainted, and another had her foot bruised in the crowd.

all these abominations, I could feel no interest in the present irrational proceedings of the human race. And if I had wanted any further proof of the christian world being in this wretched condition, Mr. Campbell's sermon in this place on Sunday last, and the appearance of the state of mind of the congregation, would have rendered more unnecessary. Never did I see so much fine talent so miserably misdirected. Never did I see human beings so ready to receive poison under the undoubting supposition that it was good and wholesome food.

Mr. Campbell is, however, according to my conviction of right and wrong, blameless. Like all other men, he has been made subject to the fifth law contained in the casket; he has been compelled to receive the instructions which have been forced into his mind, which is, by nature, of that honest firmness and consistency, that he is compelled to retain them with great tenacity.

My friends, I do say again, that so long as this weekly preaching, without reply from the congregation, shall be allowed to proceed, you and your posterity will be kept in the very depth of darkness, as you are at this hour. In consequence of this preaching, Mr. Campbell, unconscious to himself, with all his energies and fine natural talents, has fallen a complete victim to it. His mind has been closed by his early training, and consequent prepossessions, and held in chains, by which he is prevented from receiving one ray of natural and true light. He is, at this time, I am compelled to believe, in the depth of mental darkness—blind as a mole.

Thus from age to age do the blind lead the blind, until they all fall into the ditch of error. And out of this ditch, I perceive, they cannot come until some one shall open the eyes of their mind, and enable them to see the wretched condition in which they are. The present and past generations have been rendered mentally blind from their birth, and they truly require many physicians to make them whole. Now, I am persuaded, that neither Mr. Campbell nor the larger part of his congregation, were in the least conscious, that throughout his sermon on Sunday morning, he reasoned as falsely, and spoke as much error as could well be spoken in the same period.

And these false impressions were taken home by those present, whose conduct would not be improved by it in the least; for they would think worse of their neighbors who are compelled to differ from them in opinions and feelings, and immediately begin to enter upon the regular daily sins of life, such as I have described them to be—the same, in fact, as they were engaged in the day before, and all their lives. This kind of preaching has no other effect—it can have no other effect—in practice, than to perpetuate the dark ages of ignorance and hypocrisy.

And before I leave this part of the subject, I wish to put it upon record, that the most despotic power in the world, at this day, is the weekly preachings in the churches, without the liberty of reply to the preacher. And the United States, free and independent, as they

are supposed to be, are more overrun with the blind thus leading the blind than many other countries. Yes, my friends, by this cunningly devised mechanism, which extends its ramifications far and wide, even into the lands and territories the most distant, you are made to pay for erecting the buildings and the cost of repairs; to pay the preacher, and bow your neck to him, that he may the most conveniently rivet on you the chains of ignorance, and make you always subservient to his purposes. Until this evil shall be removed, there will be no hope for the rising generation. You can never be free as long as you have weekly or frequent unanswered preachings, and prayings.

Now, this is a different view of the subject from any anticipated by Mr. Campbell. His mind, in consequence of his early instruction and prepossession, has not been, in any degree, prepared for it; nor does he now, as it appears to me, perceive or comprehend much of my reasoning. I apprehend, also, there are but few in this assembly, who, with their present impressions, can be prepared to understand it.

The twelve old laws, which appear so much to puzzle Mr. Campbell, may be fitly compared to a casket in which are contained twelve of the most valuable jewels that the imagination can conceive; but a casket composed of steel so highly polished, that all who look upon it see only the reflection of their own minds. You may also imagine that the casket has been closed, by ingenious workmen employed for that purpose, many thousand years, in order that no ordinary person should open it to inspect its contents. Mr. Campbell has looked upon this casket; but with all his talents, owing to the tenacity of his early impressions, it has reflected the association only of his instructions in the christian mysteries.

A fortunate combination of circumstances, originating in certain causes, over which I had no control, has enabled me to open this casket, and at leisure calmly to survey the precious deposit therein.

The jewels it contains have laid within it for unnumbered thousands of years. They have not, therefore, that brilliant appearance, which they would possess if they had been lately polished by professed and experienced jewelers. But this evening, after the meeting adjourns, I will, although I am not an experienced working jeweler, in the absence of those more expert in the trade, take the liberty to burnish them up a little, and to-morrow endeavor to bring out some of their beauties for your inspection. I shall not have time to perform this burnishing as it ought to be done; but what the time will permit, I will do.

Mr. Campbell has said that the christian religion is divine, and that the Supreme Power, who revealed it, is most anxious that men should believe it. How came it, then, that Mahomet, after Christ had preceded him six hundred years, and the christians had all that time to mature their plans, should have obtained more proselytes, and that the Mussulmen should at this day nearly equal if not out-

number the christians? That which proves the truth of the christian religion, as Mr. Campbell has attempted to prove it, will equally prove the truth of the Mahometan, and every other religion. The verity of each depends upon the same kind of testimony—they all have their mysteries and their miracles. Whenever we become rational beings we shall be assured that the Power which governs the universe, whatever it may be, requires no mysteries or miracles to effect its purposes.

If my plan was to arouse too much local irrational feelings, it would not be difficult to make very short work of these proceedings. To enter fully into an examination of the mysteries, miracles, and errors which christians have been taught from infancy to hear with reverence, would be productive of no practical benefit. I shall, therefore, not go much into detail upon subjects, which so few are yet prepared to hear freely discussed.

There may, however, be some utility in deviating a little from the course to which originally I intended to adhere. For although I think it right, for the reasons stated, not to enter minutely into what appears to me the glaring inconsistencies of any of the religions of the world; yet as Mr. Campbell has taken so much pains to develop the whole of the christian scheme, I will advert to some of his points of defense, and afterward give a further development of those twelve fundamental laws, which Mr. Campbell calls old principles, and show that these old principles, being all proved to be facts, it becomes utterly impossible that any religion can be true.

Mr. Campbell has told you the christian religion consists in faith, and that faith depends upon testimony: that the faith necessary for you to have, is an undoubting belief in the miraculous birth, in the death and burial, and in the ascension into heaven of the man Jesus Christ, who—it is most essential, however, to believe—was really and truly the Son of God, begotten by him of a virgin.

This is the position in which Mr. Campbell has placed the discussion. He is, from the circumstances in which he has been placed from his infancy, unprepared to discuss it upon any other grounds. His mind is completely overwhelmed with the theological learning he has been induced to acquire. Mr. Campbell has little or no practical knowledge of the present state of the human mind, or of society, out of the western districts of this country.

It was not my intention, as I have previously mentioned, to enter at all into the endless details of the incomprehensible mysteries, which have been contrived to confound the understandings of the ignorant, in all the religions of the world, past and now existing.

The most intelligent of the population of Europe never think of introducing religious subjects for argument. They are well aware that all religious mysteries and miracles are opposed to reason, and are useless for any good purpose. They abandon them, therefore, to men who discard reason—to untaught women and children; and

by these means relieve their society from a subject, upon which they tacitly acknowledge that all men, who devote their time to it, become more or less insane.

I shall, therefore, not waste much of your time, and mine, by entering upon a discussion of subjects in which reason can be of no manner of use, but quite the reverse.

For reason would say, that if God made us, and could make us as he liked, and as he desired, we should believe in his existence with any definite qualities, and to obey any fixed laws for his advantage or ours, that he would at once have made us so to believe, and so to act. That he never could be angry or displeased with his own work; and that, having the ordering and direction of all things, even, as they say, of creating the very materials, all things must exist, be and act as he intended; and that nothing, by any possibility, and more particularly after the Creator saw and pronounced that "all was very good," could go wrong, or remove out of the eternal order which he foreknew or preordained.

Reason also would say, that if, by some mystery wholly incomprehensible to reason, man, the last and most finished work of this all wise, all good, and all powerful Creator, did actually disobey the laws given to him by his Creator, almost as soon as man and woman were created; and that the Creator really wished to have a good and happy race of human beings; the better mode would have been to have put Adam and Eve quietly asleep, and humanely put them out of existence again, before they had begotten any children, if they, also, were to be rendered unhappy for their parent's acting naturally under the circumstances in which they were placed.

And when Adam and Eve were thus, without experiencing pain or knowing evil, put, without noise or disturbance, out of the way, reason would say, that the Creator, if such were his wishes, having acquired the experience in which he proved himself to be deficient at the creation of the first man and woman, might, in this second attempt have succeeded to his utmost desire, and obtained men and women, who would always think as he intended they should think, and act as he made them to act.

But again—if some other mysteries, quite incomprehensible for human nature to divine, did stand in the way of God acting in this reasonable manner; and that, for this one action of man and woman, performed, no one knows how, contrary to the divine will, it became the wish of God that innumerable myriads of human beings should suffer, through thousands of generations in this world, and eternally in another; reason cannot discover why God repented himself that he had made man, or why he should suffer man to make him angry, or to thwart all his good intentions for the benefit of the human race.

But passing over these impassible matters to reason—it seems strange that God should relent in part of the horrid, cruel, and unjust treatment to which, as it appears to reason, he had doomed

mankind; and wish to devise some expedient, by which man might have some chance of relieving himself from that part of his punishment which consigns him to eternal misery.

Again—it seems very extraordinary to our faculties, that he should have created man without any power over his belief; and that God should make the condition of his escape from hell and damnation to consist in firmly believing what is opposed to his senses, and what he cannot conceive into his mind until he has been reduced from a rational to an irrational being. That is, he must believe that the Power which pervades all space overshadowed a particular virgin of the human race, and that thus the Son of God was procreated and produced; that the Son of God was an infant man, and grew as other men grow; that he was upward of thirty years in making a few individuals believe that he was the Son of God; that then he was crucified as an impostor; that this, the only Son of God in the universe, was God himself; that he died, although we are told God cannot die; that on the third day he rose from the dead, and appeared, as in his lifetime, with his natural material body: that he ate and drank with some of his disciples for forty days, at divers times and places, and then—with all his materiality, for they saw him with their material eyes—he ascended up to heaven, as they say, from whence he has never returned.

Why were these strange things made of so doubtful a character to man, that very few, compared with the number living at the time they were said to have occurred, could or did believe them? Reason also says, if God and the Son desired that all men should believe these mysteries and miracles, how came it that Mahomet successfully opposed both Father and Son on this subject, and got the better of the christians, after they had had six hundred years to fix these divine doctrines among mankind?

Reason also asks how it is that, at this day, there are, as christians say, but few sincere believers in the story of Adam and Eve, and the apple and serpent, and in the birth, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ?

But reason would ask ten thousand pertinent questions of this nature, to not one of which could a rational answer be given.

I shall only offend my intelligent hearers, by pursuing such a heterogeneous mass of incomprehensible absurdities as these; and I will, therefore, conclude this part of the subject, by asking Mr. Campbell what evidence, in these days, would now be sufficient to induce him to believe that a virgin had conceived, and was delivered of a male child? Or that one rose from the dead, and appeared with a material body, and with that body, or without it, was seen ascending up to heaven? I know that as I am constituted, and as *millions* of my fellows are, no power which we possess over our wills, can prevent us having the most thorough conviction that the whole is nothing but an invention, and a very inferior and inconsistent one, to frighten ignorant men and weak women and children out of their

sober senses, and to render them for life irrational beings, and bad members of society. And if we cannot avoid these impressions, who is to blame? Man, who cannot, by his origination, command his will contrary to his conviction, or the being who created the will for man?

This part of the subject is to me, as it exhibits the degradation to which the reasoning faculties of man has been reduced, most unpleasant, and more especially as all must become irrational on these topics, before they can become sincere. I will, therefore, dismiss it—as I hope all mankind will, before a few years have expired—and proceed to subjects which the human mind can reason upon without feeling that it is degraded by the operation.

I shall, therefore, merely repeat that, to a sane mind, Mr. Campbell's evidences are no evidences at all, except to prove the errors of the doctrines which, according to a known law of our nature, he has been compelled to receive, and which, of his own power, he cannot remove from his mind.

I hope that when he shall hereafter reflect upon this discussion, the facts stated will be sufficient to overcome his present convictions, and make a right impression on his mind, and enable him to see the inestimable practical value of the twelve fundamental laws of our nature; for then, with his talents, he would be a powerful advocate in dispelling error from the minds of others.

After taking up a large portion of your time upon these evidences, none of which would be admitted into any of our courts of law to prove the value of one dollar, Mr. Campbell gave us many learned documents and extracts from deists, atheists, and skeptics; but for what purpose in this discussion I know not, except to prove that there was no connection between my views and those of many of these writers.

The truth is, I cannot feel that high importance that many do, for writings which proceed from mere closet speculators in metaphysics, who, perceiving some of the false notions derived from the doctrines of free-will, could not discover what human nature really is, so as to be competent to recommend any particular improvement in relation to the affairs of life.

They were, therefore, men in the second stage of the human mind. They had discovered some of the errors of religion, and had lost its influences, without acquiring any better, or any substitute at all for them. I consider them, therefore, to have been in the state in which almost all the learned and most enlightened men of Europe are at this moment—without religion, and without knowledge of any other principles which can produce a superior practice in the conduct of the population of the world. This is the worst state in which society can be; and from my extensive communications with the leading minds of Europe and America, I know it to be the present condition of the civilized world. And this is the true reason why this discussion has been so necessary at this period. The world

must have a change, and it well merits a public contest to ascertain what that change shall be; whether it shall return back to the superstition and ignorance of the dark ages, or proceed forward, to bring into full practice, physically, mentally, and morally, the discoveries and improvements of the past ages, for the benefit of the human race.

It is from knowing the danger of this second stage of the human mind, and the necessity of union to accomplish any great change without evil, that you have heard of my progress from country to country. I thus proceed from one country to another with the view of laying a broad and solid foundation for a new mode of life and enjoyment, and to prepare the means to prevent society from continuing long in its present condition without a beneficial governing principle. For whatever you may think in this part of the world, the governors and great men of all countries are at present, with few exceptions, without religion, and without a knowledge of those principles which alone can create real virtue in the world. They are more at a loss to know how to govern their respective states now, owing to the general progress of knowledge, than they have been for centuries. They perceive that a great change is unavoidable; but they are at a loss to know how it is to be effected without confusion.

The British government and nation, now while I speak, are at the very height of civilization under the present irrational system of society. They inhabit a beautiful island, and possess another immediately adjoining, with a valuable population, capable of rendering and receiving to and from each other every possible social service, benefit and advantage; yet, at this moment, that government is greatly at a loss to determine what measures to adopt, to put that population in a state of prosperity. The opposing parties were lately on the point of dissension; and if they had proceeded to hostilities, no one could calculate the extent of the evil and misery that would have followed. And what is the real obstacle to their union, prosperity, and happiness? It is religion. Ask the Irish if, to their cost, they have not found religion to be the greatest curse with which they have ever been afflicted? In Ireland, it has been the parent of every crime and evil, of which the mind can conceive. Were that obstacle removed, what a glorious opportunity would arise to make that country one of the most beautiful, and the inhabitants among the most happy, in any part of the world. Yes, I know nothing but religion, and the consequent ignorance which it generates of our nature, which now prevents Ireland from becoming one of the most desirable places of abode in any of the four quarters of the globe—little short, indeed, of the paradise described by Mr. C. But all the members who administer the government of Great Britain, as well as the population, are utterly at a loss to know what to do with their over-abundant means of creating a surplus wealth, and a superior character for the population of both islands. They

are like sheep without a shepherd—they know not whither to go, what new direction to take, or how to overcome the difficulties in which they are involved. I well know, and have known for twenty years past, that measures were in a steady progress to produce this state of things in both islands. I have long known that they were proceeding at a rapid pace through all the necessary previous stages, until they should come to a point, beyond which they could not advance without an entire change of the principles by which they have been governed. And they have now reached this point. Fortunately for them, and the world, they must now adopt new principles and practices.

The circumstances which now exist everywhere, plainly indicate to all who are engaged in the affairs of men, that the population of the world is gorged with the means of obtaining every good thing; but that such is the ignorance which prevails, that instead of rationally using the wealth so easily to be obtained, or properly applying the newly-acquired scientific means, by which the best things to promote the happiness of society may be beneficially procured in the greatest abundance, the wealth accumulates in a few hands, and is misapplied; while the new producing powers obtained from mechanical improvements and chemical discoveries are so misdirected, as to be made the most powerful engines yet known, to inflict poverty and distress on the largest portion of mankind. I mean that portion of it, which, by their labor, produces all the wealth which is consumed by those who create none for themselves.

But, my friends, although I foresaw distinctly, twenty years ago, that these results would necessarily arise from the progress of new improvements and inventions, and published my reasons for these opinions; yet, so little is the world aware of these movements, the inevitable consequences of this new state of things, that the change is, even now, coming upon the most civilized nations "like a thief in the night," unheeded and unprovided for. You know not, that the very circumstances in which you and the whole population of the world at present exist, render it inevitable that this, the most mighty change which the world has yet experienced, must take place within a few years. There is no power on earth, that can resist its progress. It is proceeding forward with a mighty impetus, such as your minds are now inadequate to comprehend. This new scientific, mechanical and chemical power is advancing with the efficient force of an army equal to many hundred millions of men, well disciplined, equipped and provided, to accomplish its purpose.

Irresistible, however, as this force now is, it is daily upon the increase. It is annually recruited in Europe and America, but chiefly in Great Britain and the United States, by new inventions, and extensions of the old, with new powers, such as appal the present state of the human mind to contemplate, and far exceed the belief of those who are inexperienced upon these subjects. I believe I am much within the real amount, when I state, that the increase of this new power within the last ten years, over Europe and America, has

exceeded in its results, each year, upon the average of that period, the well directed industry of *twenty millions of laborers* unaided by machinery or other scientific aid.

This is the power which will force the nations who are now the most advanced in arts and sciences to stand still, and inquire what is to be done with this enormous force, daily increasing, in direct competition with all the producing classes, having a continual tendency to diminish, under the existing system of trade and commerce, the value of their labor, and to reduce them and their families to poverty and slavery. Modern governments know not what measures to adopt, to give this enormous and continually increasing power a right direction. Yes! as governments and nations, they will be speedily overwhelmed by that worthless object, for which they have been all taught to sacrifice their real happiness, and which they now worship as their god. I mean WEALTH—what is called gold and silver and bank notes, which, after all, but represent *real* wealth.

There will soon be so much real wealth produced, by the daily multiplying labor-saving machines, that nations will be no longer competent to prosecute any of their present measures with success. This wealth will accumulate, and become as an impassable mountain barrier to permanent prosperity. It has already, in your technical phrase, overstocked many, and soon it will oversupply all markets; and require, in consequence, more and more exertion from the working and middle classes, to enable them to live.

These are the signs of the times. I wish your eyes could be opened, to enable you to perceive these things even a little way off; for they are, while I speak, but a short distance from us. I see it in the smoke of your new factories before me. I hear it in the strokes of your heavy hammers, mechanically moved, which now din upon the ear. This is one reason why this discussion is so necessary at this period. It well merits a public contest, to ascertain what that change, which all things indicate to be so near at hand, shall be; whether it shall return back to the superstition and ignorance of the dark ages, or proceed forward, to bring into full practice, physically, mentally, and morally, the discoveries and improvements of the past ages, for the benefit of the human race.

We may, therefore, dismiss these quotations of Mr. Campbell's, from the atheists, deists, skeptics, etc., as he calls them; for they do not, in any degree, belong to the subject. I brought none of them forward to support my argument. He had supposed that I had none but such broken reeds to depend upon, and he prepared his defense accordingly. I have derived little advantage from the past writings of the human race, except as finger-posts, to inform me "that this is not the right road to virtue and happiness."

I have derived far more wisdom, from calmly and attentively watching the minds and proceedings of children, from a very early age, than I have acquired from all the writings, sacred and profane, that I have read.

The authors of these works assumed facts which did not exist, reasoned upon them as though they were true, and let their imaginations run into every kind of error. Hence the mythologies of the Pagans, and the mysteries and miracles of the Jews, Hindoos, Christians, and Mahometans. All the sacred and theological writings of the Pagans, Jews, Hindoos, Christians, and Mahometans, are of no value. Nay, my friends, instead of any real value, they are the greatest evil existing among men; for they derange or destroy all the superior faculties and feelings of the human race, and make man, as he is at this day, more irrational than any of the animal creation.

For the brute creation, as we call them, act agreeably to their nature, and enjoy it; while man, governed by the caprice of his imagination, acts contrary to it, and is miserable.

The millions of volumes of this kind of writing, with which the world has been burthened, have had but one object—and that is, to derange all the faculties of those who read them. It were happy for mankind if they could all be collected in one heap—and an immense one it would be — with fire placed under it, so that it might be consumed until not a fragment was left. The conflagration would be the greatest blessing that could now be conferred upon the human family. It is from these books that you have derived your present irrational ideas. And until those ideas can be extracted from your minds; until they can be unassociated, even to their very foundations; until your minds can be regenerated, and made to receive other and wholly opposite ideas, founded on principles all true, and therefore all consistent with each other, you will see nothing, except through a glass so dark and obscure, that you cannot distinguish one object as it really exists in nature.

I have said that all the sacred and theological writings, of all religions, are of no value; for they have not taught us a practice that is of any utility; they cannot teach one.

To acquire true wisdom, the world must become again as little children, and observe, with care, the facts which everywhere abound to give them true and valuable knowledge. For the world has almost everything yet to acquire from these facts, relative to a superior mode of existence.

The inhabitants of the earth have, indeed, eyes, but see not; ears have they, but hear not; understandings, and understand not. For all their natural senses are deceived by false instruction from infancy, and thereby rendered highly injurious.

While every past and present fact demonstrates that your character, from birth to death, is formed for you, you have been made, by a legerdemain of which you are quite unconscious, to believe that you form them yourselves, and that you have merit or demerit for what you are. Why, my friends, whether you have been made vessels of honor or dishonor, you are no more than wax or clay in the hands of the potter.

I hope the time is approaching, when I shall be permitted to discharge an important duty to you and all mankind. Silver and gold have I not now to spare; and if I had, it could be of no real use to you. But I trust that I shall give you that which is beyond all price, and thereby render gold and silver unnecessary to you, to your children, and to all future generations. Instead of mankind being, as heretofore, as clay in the hands of the potter, I have the most thorough conviction, that it is now practicable to make you potters yourselves for your children; and I can show you the way to become good potters, so as to enable you to new form them, to the extent that the materials of which they are composed will admit; then shall I do for you, and them, and future generations, the greatest service that one man has ever performed for his fellows. I do not despair, indeed, of enabling many of the present generation, by certain inducements, derived from real knowledge, to place themselves in a new furnace, as it were, in which their hearts and minds shall be softened, and by which operation, they may be enabled, in part, even to amend some of the numerous deformities and imperfections which, through the ignorance of their instructors, they have been compelled to receive.

This many will be enabled to do for themselves; but their children, through an early training and instruction in this invaluable knowledge, may be made to become greatly superior in this new art or calling; while their children again, will greatly improve upon their immediate predecessors. And thus shall an improved character be given, through all future time, to every succeeding generation.

This happy result will arise when all the jewels within the casket shall be so burnished as to compel public attention to examine, not only their external beauty, but their intrinsic worth.

Now, my friends, can I give you anything of more intrinsic value, than to enable you to make your offspring superior, physically and intellectually, to the most perfect human being that now exists? I can do this; and this I will not cease to endeavor to do, while health and the power of exertion shall be spared to me. There is nothing in the whole range of human society, that can be, in any degree, compared with the value of this knowledge. Having this, you will have everything; and without it, you have comparatively nothing.

When you shall thus become expert potters, and be enabled to put your children in superior moulds, there will be no occasion for weekly preachings—no necessity for formal precepts, of any kind, to adults. The superior formation of the character of each individual will be secured in childhood; and before the period of youth expires, it will be matured in good habits and dispositions—in a correct knowledge of human nature, through a close inspection of the laws within the casket; and it will have attained the high intellectual acquirements and fixed moral principles, which will make it evident to all that the present weekly preachings are most injurious to the best and highest interests of the human race.

And unless this superior workmanship shall be applied at an early period of life, it is useless to expect that it can ever be effectually well done afterward. When your children have been put into an ill-formed mould from infancy, and thereby forced to acquire irrational feelings for their fellows, erroneous ideas and notions respecting their own powers and bad habits, which tenaciously adhere to them, it is in vain that you can expect to undo that, except by some accidental occurrence, which has been so unfortunately done at the most important period of the child's life, for giving the best form to his character.

You have heard much from my friend Mr. Campbell, of the genius and tendency of the christian faith and religion. He has told you what he has been taught to believe of it from his youth upward. And he has informed you what his impressions are, with as much honesty as a conscientious Mussulman would tell you of the spirit and genius of the Mahometan faith and religion. For the Mahometans and Hindoos are as conscientious in their belief, and as tenacious of the superiority of their religion, as Mr. Campbell, or any christian in christendom, can be of theirs. And have they not as much faith as the members of any other religion?

But the conscientiousness or tenacity of the Pagan, Jew, Hindoo, Christian, or Mahometan, do not add one grain to the argument in favor of the divine origin or truth of either. They prove only the divine origin and truth of the fifth law of human nature; and the value, beyond price, which it will become to the world when it shall be regenerated and born again, and it shall cease to be dead in trespasses and sins, as almost all christendom, as the other portions of the world are at present.

We shall presently see how these laws of nature harmonize and explain each other, and their applicability to all the business and duties of life.

Did Mr. Campbell explain to you the spirit and genius of the christian system? I listened to him with all the attention in my power; and then I contrasted, in my mind, the real effects produced in christendom by that spirit and genius. Because, my friends, it is "by their fruits that ye shall know them."

The mode of judging of the tree by its fruit, is alone the one I adopt, when I examine the spirit and genius of any religion, of any government, of any code of laws, or any of the institutions which flow from them. And by this guide, I have, without prejudice or favor, compared the spirit and genius of the christian mysteries, miracles, fables, and dogmas, with their fruits; and by their fruits, so abundantly growing around me in every direction, I have become intimately acquainted with the tree, from the blossom to the root.

And what have I found this tree, of two thousand years' growth, to produce in every soil in which it has been planted? Abundance of insincerity and deception; for the whole life of a christian is a continued striving in opposition to his nature, and, therefore, of necessity,

he must be a hypocrite. It is notorious over Asia and Africa, that there is so little truth in a christian, that little or no faith is placed in what he may say or do. But, to come nearer home — show me a man or woman, in the city of Cincinnati, whose daily life is not a perpetual lie to his or her profession. It cannot be otherwise. It is necessarily so; and no one can avoid this consequence, without being so unnatural as not to partake of human nature. It is the natural fruit of the tree. It is the spirit, the genius, the necessary tendency of christianity; and, therefore, the individuals who have been compelled to receive it, are objects of our greatest compassion.

Other fruits of this tree are pride, and spiritual pride among many other kinds of it, and envy and jealousy.

My friends, do you know any pride of wealth, of birth, of connections; any spiritual pride, any pride of learning, or personal pride, in this city? Do you know any who envy the advantages possessed, or which they suppose to be possessed by others? Or do you know any who are jealous of their neighbor's superiority, or of their feelings for others, in preference to themselves? If you do, these are the genuine fruits of this tree; and you well know they superabound everywhere.

Other fruits of this same tree are, ignorance and presumption, most peculiarly combined.

Have you any ignorant among you, who know nothing of themselves, and very little of nature; who yet imagine themselves to be *God's elect;* and who, in consequence, look down upon their fellow-beings as though they were not of the same species, and say, "Stand aloof, for I am more holy than thou?"

This again is the natural fruit of the tree. Religious wars, massacres, and persecutions for conscience sake, are also some of its fruit; and these have been shed abundantly all over christendom.

It is unnecessary to tell me what any system will do when carried into practice, while I have its practical results before me; while I see what it has produced in the *past*, and what it is producing in the *present*, time — what it produces *to-day*, and what it *must* produce during the continuance of the practice among men. From the facts and reasonings thus obtained, it is most evident, that if the christian doctrines were to continue to form your characters for ten thousand years, they would make you, at the end of that period, worse than you are to-day; for they are daily becoming more and more incongruous, when compared with the knowledge derived from the growing experience of the world. In the very nature of the doctrines which the gospel enforces upon the young and tender mind, every generation, if it can be supposed possible that these doctrines, in opposition to experience, could continue to influence them, must become more and more irrational. For as the world advances in knowledge and experience, the professing christian must necessarily become either more hypocritical or more ignorant. And from this

simple cause, I doubt whether, since the days of Christ's first appearing, there ever was a time of more hypocrisy, over the whole of christendom, than at the present.

I know the world cannot help being what it is; you cannot help being what you are. And, in consequence of the overwhelming circumstances which now exist, religious societies are now everywhere a cheat from beginning to end. Owing to the certain information I have derived from the casket, I can easily discover that your looks, your words, and your actions are continually opposed to each other.

Do not be offended, my friends, nor suppose I speak in anger, or with the intention to offend you. So far from being angry, I feel the utmost, the most sincere compassion for you, and all who are, like you, under the influence of any religious delusion.

I do not attach a particle of blame to one of you. Possessing the knowledge contained in this casket, and the charity which it necessarily compels me to have for every human being, how can I blame you? Do I not know, with the greatest certainty, how the character of each has been formed *for* him from infancy.

My friends, every one admits—even your sacred books teach, that there is no possibility of judging fairly of any tree, save by its fruits. I, therefore, judge of christianity by the bitter fruits which it has produced wheresoever it has been planted.

My friends, I have had time only to polish some parts, and those imperfectly, of the contents of this casket, as you have witnessed. This afternoon, I shall be prepared with some more of it, and I will endeavor to produce as much as will occupy our attention from four to five o'clock. Seeing the course Mr. Campbell has adopted, I wish to have time to do equal justice to the subject which I advocate. I do not like to depend solely upon the accidental ideas which may arise when I address you without any preparation. For as I enter more fully into this subject, its importance continually grows upon me. Having proceeded thus far in attempts to open a new light in this city, as it must be to many of you, I am the most desirous not to leave you partially informed respecting it. I wish to do justice, in this case, to the subject, to you, and to the millions to whom these records will be transmitted. I therefore trust, that it will not be too inconvenient to the gentlemen who sit as moderators, to allow time sufficient to do that which it would be most improper to leave undone. I could not begin to reply to Mr. C. until he had finished his elaborate argument and his long chain of documents, which have occupied one half more time than I required to place my views before you—and he speaks, as you may notice, three words for two of mine. I mean not, however, to occupy your time with words without corresponding ideas, as must be done in all cases in which much is spoken on the subject of any religion. For the mysteries of religion can be made to pass current only when many words are used to confound the understanding of the hearers, by no defi-

nite meaning being attached to them. When the deepest prejudices of mankind have to be uprooted, there must be substantial ideas for each word to represent, and ideas, too, that are perfectly consistent with each other, or I shall have no chance of making the permanent impression I intend. I have promised, that when I shall have finished this part of the discussion, if Mr. Campbell, or any other individual, shall discover one error, or one inconsistency, in the principles and system which I advocate, I will give up the whole contest. For should one error be found, I shall be convinced I have been deceived; for where there is inconsistency, there cannot be truth. At present I say no more.

[*Here some conversation took place between the chairman and Mr. Campbell. Mr. Owen stated that he would be prepared to proceed with his afternoon's address, after Mr. C. had replied, as he wished to do, to what he had offered this morning.*]*

Mr. *Owen* resumed: I am sure we are all greatly indebted to the moderators who have attended here so punctually day by day. They have given us already so much of their time, that I can readily suppose it will be inconvenient for them to continue their attendance much longer. I have done all that seemed to me desirable, to curtail the duration of this discussion. My friend, Mr. Campbell, no doubt, deemed it of great importance to place before the public all his notions of the system in which he has been trained; and it has been the extraordinary length of my friend's erudite exposition, (during the utterance of which I was under the necessity to remain silent), that has taken up so much of the time.

But, my friends, there is another view of this subject. The systems which I have to oppose are of several thousand years' standing. They have been supported, during these thousand years, by millions of ministers, who have been paid, in that time, enormous sums to instruct the population in various countries—and for more than a hundred in this.

Can it be expected, then, that in a few days, or rather in little more than one—for, during this discussion, I have spoken but fifteen hours—I can unassociate in your minds all the ideas thus derived from past ages—ideas which have been instilled into your minds with so much care, from your birth? Is it to be expected, I ask you, my friends, that, in a few hours, I can combat and put to flight all the host of errors which have been accumulating for thou-

* This conversation was to this effect. Mr. C. asked Mr. Chairman whether Mr. Owen had a right to change the times of adjournment, and whether his having adjourned to 10 o'clock this morning was not contrary to our original stipulations. Moreover, said Mr. C., I would ask whether Mr. Owen should be allowed time to retire to *write* speeches as circumstances may require; and whether we must wait here from day to day, so long as Mr. Owen can write new essays upon the twelve "*Divine* laws of human nature;" adjourning from time to time, as may suit his writing convenience? Mr. Owen's recalling the motion to adjourn till *four* o'clock and promising to be prepared at *three*, prevented a reply from the board.

sands of years, when, by the fundamental laws of human nature, we are compelled to retain early impressions with great tenacity?

Although such a result no one would anticipate, I have yet unbounded confidence in the omnipotence of truth. I care not what obstacles may be placed in its way; whatever they are, I expect that, sooner or later, they will be overcome. If, on the present occasion, I shall not be allowed time for the full performance of the task I wish to accomplish, I trust it shall be so executed, within whatever time is now to be allowed before the discussion terminates, that what I put upon record will be sufficient to induce those who have not yet been taught to reflect upon these subjects to begin to think for themselves. I can hardly believe that there can be any wish that this subject should not be as fully heard on one side as it has been on the other; or that what remains to be said on my part should not be said in the best manner.

But, my friends, I find that upon this, as upon all other occasions, we must necessarily be governed by the circumstances which surround us. To these circumstances I must yield, as we are all obliged to do, when we cannot change those in which we are involved. It seems the circumstances which limit this debate cannot now be easily changed. I must, therefore, submit to the audience the remainder of what I intend to say, without having time to do all the justice to the subject which its high practical importance deserves.

These debates are familiar to Mr. C., and he has been in the practice of public speaking week after week, or rather day by day, for many years. I am obliged to think well what I say, before I give it utterance. It is always necessary, but now peculiarly so, for me, after the engagement I have made, to take care that there shall be no inconsistency in anything I may say. I have only to regret that what I speak is not likely to be so well digested as that which I should write at more leisure. But as I am now to be governed in what I shall say, to the termination of this discussion, by the impulse of the moment, I trust that the ideas and expressions which may arise, when I address you in the afternoon, will be equal to the emergency.

Adjourned to meet at three o'clock, when the discussion is to be closed.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWENTY-THIRD REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—Public attention and curiosity have been much excited from the first proposal of this discussion even up to the present moment. On Mr. Owen's first appearance in this country, our expectations were raised to an unusual degree. Coming direct from one of the most enlightened countries in the world; having traversed the British Isles, and visited several places on the continent of Europe; professing to have discovered very great errors in the present order of society, and to have it in his power to new modify the world, by some very rational changes, resulting from the march

of mind and the progress of science; our expectations were very much raised, and we bade the benevolent visitant a hearty welcome to our shores. Under these favorable circumstances Mr. Owen was received by the good citizens of these United States. He was treated with all the liberality of our republican institutions.

In his first addresses he was cautious and reserved on the subject of religion. It is true, indeed, that from the first address which I saw in print from Mr. Owen, I observed the poison artfully infused into the golden chalice which he presented to the American people. But for some time he was a little cautious. He became bold; and finally, as large as life, he appeared the advocate of irreligion, or no religion; and, like all his brotherhood in France, he talked much of reason and common sense. Philosophy, too, [most abused word], was adored as the patron goddess of the whole scheme. All this, too, associated with a good moral exterior, uncommon mildness and suavity of temper, procured for Mr. Owen (to say nothing of the charms of wealth), a degree of respect and courtesy which would not have been shown to the system in the person of almost any other advocate, and still less in the person of one who should have exhibited the more natural and the more usual tendency of the system in his own conduct.

But, added to all this, it was published far and wide that Mr. Owen was a gentleman of the most extensive reading, great research, a first rate political economist, and profoundly acquainted with everything connected with the political, religious, and economical systems, practices, and relations of mankind. He seemed to understand everything relative to the subjects on which he declaimed and wrote more profoundly than any person else; and from the plenary confidence and the air of infallibility which decorated his ratiocinations, deductions, and proofs, all were almost afraid to call any of his dogmas in question. Progressing thus, specious in his philosophy, and the perfect gentleman in his manners, it was not to be wondered at that he found many disciples and admirers in all parts of the country whithersoever he turned his course. He attempted to organize societies among us, and to set on foot a new order of things. But religion impedes his progress, and finally it absorbs all his energies and those of his friends. It is combated on new principles, as it did appear, and was threatened to be prostrated by *reason* and *science*. The old artillery of *little Deists* and *petty cavilers* were all to be laid aside, and nothing but the apparatus of good logic and genuine philosophy were to be employed by Mr. Owen in pulling down all the religions in the world. And now our ears have heard and our eyes have seen the whole strength of this new armament against the faith. This discussion will, I think, be a new and no ordinary confirmation of the faith of christians. Mr. Owen, the cool philosopher, the great political economist, the universal reader, the extensive traveler, the shrewd and logical thinker, after surveying the productions of six thousand years, appears with the maturity of

almost threescore years, laden with the spoils of time, standing upon the shoulders of all the skeptics of Greece, Rome, England, and America, selects the most puissant weapons, and chooses the best mode of attack, which all his reading, observation, and experience could devise. You have heard it, my friends, you have seen it all in twelve principles, all poised *upon one metaphysical question.* This is the *dos pou sto* of Archimedes. Here Mr. Owen places the fulcrum for his puissant lever which is to raise the human family from all the superstitions, good and bad, and from all political degradation, from poverty, ignorance and suffering. This is the "*summum bonum,*" "the philosopher's stone"—the old doctrine of Epicurus in modern broadcloth.

Now it is lawfully to be presumed, that Mr. Owen has taken the strongest ground which can be taken upon the skeptical hypotheses. He has seen where all his predecessors have been foiled ; and, therefore, selects the ark of safety, the impregnable fortress, the strongest tower which his imagination and reason could grasp. Forth comes the essay which you have heard. This is the cream of fifty years' reading, traveling, studying, conversing with minds of the "best caliber," arrayed in the majesty of twelve propositions, which will equally suit the horse and his rider. Mr. Owen appears brandishing the *sixth, the fatal sixth,* which, like a two-edged sword, is to cut off all the heads of all the priests and kings in the world.

Upon the whole, we were glad to see Mr. Owen take such high ground. First, because he made Thomas Paine, Gibbon, *cum multis aliis,* with all the old skeptics, a set of simpletons and driveling philosophers. And next, because he was all for reason and philosophy, which no intelligent christian ever feared. We met him on his own *five propositions,* on which he defied the world. You, however, heard the contents of Mr. Owen's logic upon these premises. And you have seen what he has offered in defense of them. It would be only a species of insult to the good sense of any hearer of this discussion to state again that Mr. Owen has only repeated over and over the same dogmas ; and that he has *in every instance* refused joining issue either upon his own propositions or mine. He has met all sorts of argument by mere assertions, by mere declamation.

Regarding Mr. Owen as the present *magnus Apollo* of skepticism, as a man of great reason and philosophy, we did most certainly expect that he would *reason* and not merely *assert*—that he would not at last, when foiled in argument, descend into the ranks of those little spirits who strut about in the pomposity of two or three witticisms or sneers, which they have heard and retail from some infidel apostle. Nay, indeed, I did not expect to hear Mr. Owen talking in the ribaldry of these little demagogues of infidelity, who talk about Eve, and the apple, and the serpent, about the Virgin Mary, and Joseph, with a sort of significant grin, expressing the great detestation of their great little souls against such fables!

There is nothing proof against those Parthian missiles that the

vanquished Parthian throws behind him on his retreat from the pursuing conqueror. I could, without pretending to any genius in this way, turn every virtue in the world to ridicule, and laugh out of countenance the gravest and best man that ever lived. Only, as the great Warburton said, "put a fool's coat upon a philosopher or a saint, and you may, under this covering, laugh him down." Call *bravery* temerity; call *generosity* prodigality; call *wisdom* gravity; call *honesty* simplicity; and *good manners* foppery; and the work is done. So the atheist ridicules the idea of God. A pretty world this, to come from a *rational first cause!* Talk not of wisdom while you see so much folly in the universe! Only see the waste of water and the waste of land; only look, says he, how many half begun operations, and how many unfinished enterprises there are. Look at the deformities and the irregularities, and the mal-adaptations everywhere. Talk not of *goodness*, says the ridiculing atheist: don't you see poisons lurking in your fields and gardens—pestilence and death stealing upon you in the invisible miasmata? Talk not of *justice:* see the good man punished for his virtue, and the wicked rewarded for his vice, etc., etc. So the idea of God is laughed out of the world by the atheists. Tell me the virtue I cannot caricature and render ridiculous. I will call humility meanness; charity pride or ostentation; and then, under such a garb, laugh them out of society.

Is there any way of proving, in a court of law, that Queen Elizabeth or Oliver Cromwell once lived? If there be, the same sort of evidence will prove in a court of law that all the gospel facts are true. But there is as much *wit* in a peddler's telling you to prove how many yards are in a given web, by weighing it in scales, or by putting it into a bushel, as there is in Mr. Owen's telling you, you cannot prove the gospel facts in a court of law.

His Adam and Eve, the apple and serpent puns are very puissant weapons in his armor; and his representing the imbecility, or folly, or malevolence of the Deity, in giving birth to the present state of things, are all in unison with the nice discernment, good taste and fine feelings of the champion of skepticism. The human body and all its organs, internal and external, by the same logic could be shown to be ridiculous. Call it an animal machine, and then examine it in detail. You may then laugh at yourselves, as we might conceive an actor would who had assumed a character which did not suit him.

But, my friends, I cannot but admire the influence which christianity has now exhibited in you. In speaking of the christian religion this morning, as on other occasions, Mr. Owen has severely tested the influence of christianity upon us. He has tried our christian patience and forbearance to the utmost. I feel a degree of pride to see you bear these indignities with so much patience. These insults were all gratuitous, and ill-timed, too, if there be any time for insults. When I was laying before you the historic evidences of

christianity, if Mr. Owen had any objection to any of the historic facts, testimonies, or proofs adduced, then was the time to have made his objections. But it is an easy method of refuting any argument, *to say* it is impertinent, or inconclusive; to *call* any document a *fable*, a *legend*; and to *represent* the most credible testimony in the world as a *story*, a *fiction*. This is a wholesale way of rebutting all argument and proof, and I am much disappointed to find the boasted reason of the skeptical heroes, compelled to adopt this miserable subterfuge of the poorest drivelers, who have not sense to know when a point is proved, or when a conclusion is fairly drawn from just premises. Mr. Owen arrogates too much for a philosopher. He puts himself in the *Pope's* chair, and makes his *say so*, his *ipse dixit*, go as far as the Roman Pontiff ever claimed for himself. I have never heard so few *therefores*, so few *illative* particles in as much reading as in Mr. Owen's speeches.

But after all Mr. Owen's great reading and research, there is one book which he has not often read, and which, above all others, he ought (*even to attack it successfully*) often to have read. I need not tell you that this is the Bible. It is true, indeed, that he told me he read it some two or three times when an infant at school—but what of that? At this I am astonished! How dare any man attack a book of such high pretensions, from a school-boy-reading of it? But this is in unison with the skeptical school. Thomas Paine wrote against the Bible from recollections, and acknowledged that he had not much read it. David Hume acknowledged, not long before his death, that he had never seriously read the New Testament through. I have never, to this hour, met with a skeptic, who was well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, or who had, in his writings, evinced that he had given them a close or critical examination. If it were lawful thus to retort upon Mr. Owen, I would engage to prove that his opposition to christianity is founded upon his ignorance of it, instead of its being founded upon the ignorance of mankind, in his sense, or as he presumes.

Mr. Owen's logic reads thus: I have read five hours *per diem* for twenty-five years. I have explored all the systems of government, political economy, and of religion for *forty* years. I have visited many countries. I have early discovered the influence which the doctrines of *free-will* have upon the advocates of this system. I have come in contact with the greatest minds of the present day:—*therefore* (pardon this one *therefore*), all religions are false. Moses was an astrologer, a sorcerer, or what you please; the passage of Israel through the Red Sea, and the miracle said to have been wrought in Egypt, are mere legends; all the prophets and apostles were impostors. Yes, from my experience and observation, all religions ought to be proved by arithmetic, and when we come to add up the evidences, they are as absurd as one plus one, equal three. This is one half of his logic; and the other is as follows: I say to a blind man, This is a piece of *blue* cloth—I don't believe you, sir, he

replies, Why? I ask—He answers, it does not *smell blue*—I do not *hear* or *taste* it *blue*—I cannot *feel* it *blue*. All this may be true, yet all this will not prove that it is not blue. But upon such logic does Mr. Owen rely for the proof of his five positions.

If Mr. Owen's experience is to be relied upon by us, he claims the very same sort of faith from us that the Apostle Paul claimed, and without affording us any evidence. And surely we have infinitely more reason to rely upon the testimony of Paul in attestation of *palpable facts*, that upon the testimony of Mr. Owen in attestation of his *opinions*—I *think*, and *I saw*, are very different sorts of evidences upon matters of fact.

Mr. Owen might think, from his mode of reasoning, that the inhabitant of the torrid zone, who would not believe him that water became in the Ohio river so hard and firm, that wagons and horses passed upon its surface; or that the inhabitants of Iceland, who would not believe him that there were men as black as jet in Virginia; I say, he might think such persons very incredulous; and yet, upon his own principles, they could not believe him because they had no such experience.* I presume the absurdity of this species of reasoning has already been made apparent to the dullest capacity. We do not suppose that Mr. Owen's experience is equal to set aside any single fact well attested, of an ordinary or extraordinary character, and still less equal to disprove any fact which occurred two thousand years ago.

To ridicule your faith, my friends, upon such feeble arguments as Mr. Owen has to offer in favor of infidelity, appears to me as impolitic as it is profane. When men have reasoned very strongly, and carried a point by a very powerful attack upon the human understanding, they may be allowed to slacken the reins upon their passions, and to make some appeal to the hearts or feelings of the audience. But this supposes a case very unlike that before us. Mr. Owen commenced his ridicule before he had weakened the faith of a single soul in the audience. And, indeed, I must tell you that I have never felt so much disgusted at the spirit of infidelity, as in hearing this last speech from Mr. Owen. The abuse was uncalled for, undeserved, and every way mal-apropos. I could not but think of, I could not but remember, while he was uttering those scoffs, an anecdote which I heard a few days ago from a citizen of this city, concerning a Dr. Patterson of England. This bold and impious skeptic riding out in harvest-time in England, was overtaken with his companions in a violent storm of wind and rain, which prostrated the harvest fields, and seemed to blast the hopes of the husbandmen of the vicinity. Coming into contact with some christians, who were probably talking of the calamity, he remarked, "Only see what

* It is said that the king of Siam ordered the Dutch navigator, who asserted that water in Holland occasionally became passable for men and horses, to be punished for lying.—*Reporter.*

sort of a God you christians worship! Don't you think he ought to be tied up and whipped for sending such a storm upon your fields in this important crisis?" But this saucy skeptic was not permitted long to pass unpunished [call it my superstition if you please]; and by a shower of rain too, the God of christians called him to account. For not long after, while attending a horse race, a heavy shower of rain coming up, compelled him and his companions to seek a shelter. While endeavoring to escape, his horse stumbled, fell, and broke his master's neck. So departed this life, the scoffing doctor. But, although I doubt not many thousand such occurrences happen, I would not draw a general conclusion from them, and say, that so it shall always happen. No, indeed, "the Lord knows how to reserve the ungodly until the day of judgment to be punished." But to speak as philosophy authorizes, it is only in the absence of argument, that recourse is had to ridicule, and the chair of the scoffer is never filled until that of the logician is vacated.

But when Mr. Owen assails us, my friends, through the medium of our sectarian divisions and discords, 'tis then he wounds us most sensibly. He has told you very plainly, several times in this discussion, that it was the wild and conflicting dogmas and rancors of sectarian pride and jealousy that made him first of all a skeptic, and you see this yet confirms him in his skepticism. Here we are vulnerable. Were it not for the spirit and temper, as well as for the foolish and absurd dogmas of the fashionable systems of religion, the attacks of skeptics would avail no more than the barkings of a dog at the full moon. Even here, however, this logic fails: for what good thing under heaven has not been abused and perverted by the wickedness of man! And is it not an axiom among all reasoners upon all subjects, that no man can reasonably make the *abuse* of anything an argument either against the use of the thing, or the thing itself?

But as the matter has stood, and now stands, we should have been discouraged long since in vindicating the divine authority of this religion, had not Paul and the other Apostles foretold these times—these divisions; their rise, continuance, and termination. And although it is a fact, and an evidence, which, in itself, and abstractly considered, is very discouraging; yet, when contemplated through the data which the New Testament affords, it forms a very powerful evidence of the divine authenticity of this religion. To this we have paid sufficient attention while reasoning upon *the Apostasy*, and need not now repeat what was then demonstrated; namely, that, from the beginning, it was known, foreseen, and declared, that such an apostasy should, for certain ends and purposes, take place. It has taken place, and has fully corresponded with all the predictions of its rise and progress, and the signs of its speedy destruction are among the most impressive signs of the times.

The necessity of the *union* of all the disciples of Christ, in order to the triumphant and universal spread of the gospel throughout all nations, was distinctly declared, and its influence fully depicted in that

admirable prayer of the founder of our religion, in the 17th chapter of John: "Neither," said he, "pray I for these alone (who now believe in me and are my Apostles to the nations), but for all them who will hereafter believe on me *through their testimony;* that they *all may be one;* that *the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" The universal conviction of the world of the truth of the divine mission of Jesus, is made dependent on the *union and harmony* of the disciples of Jesus. And as this view of the matter came from the fountain-head of all wisdom and goodness, it is fairly to be presumed, that it is a *sine qua non*—a something indispensable to the progress, and all-triumphant success of christianity; *that until christians are united, the world cannot be converted to the belief of the mission of Jesus.*

I doubt not but the ground, the true ground of christian union, is now discovered; and it has been declared in this discussion more than once—indirectly it is true, but it is fairly inferable from these premises. It is this—*that christian faith is to be known and recognized as a belief of the gospel facts, and not the assent of the human understanding to certain matters of opinion*—a belief of *facts*, and not of opinions dependent upon the *acuteness* of the human intellect or the logical powers of inferential reasoners. A regard to men's moral actions, more than to the strength of their intellects, will soon subvert the metaphysical systems of past ages; and place christianity upon a new footing in the eyes of the world. This is not the place, nor the occasion, for the minute exposition of these sentiments; but they can be given, and they do now appear in the publications of the day; but so far we deemed it expedient to call up this matter, alike to the consideration of skeptics and of christians.

But still I am very far from agreeing with Mr. Owen that christianity, as it is now taught, is the greatest curse to mankind. Mr. Owen, who never speaks anything but the truth, will have to retract this assertion. For most surely there are many greater curses in the nations of this world, than is christianity to the people of the United States. *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.* Apella the Jew may believe it, and not I. It will require more facts and documents than Mr. Owen can command to make good this assertion.

I did entertain some hopes that when Mr. Owen arose, he was about to concede that he had been mistaken; that christianity is what it purports to be—a revelation from God. I felt conscious that he could not rebut the arguments in favor of christianity; and did hope, as he would doubtless find them too strong for him, that he would have the candor to retract the rash positions he had taken.

It is true, indeed, that I thought Mr. Owen, of all men, the most unlikely to be convinced. I know that the circumstances created for him and by him rendered his conviction almost impossible. He has been so long the apostle of his own tenets, his whole soul has been engaged in these speculations. He is one of the most extraordinary men; he cares not for praise; he knows, he says, he deserves it not;

and as for fame, he has no taste for it at all! To these causes is to be attributed, perhaps, his insensibility to the force or power of argument. It is not reasonable that a person who has so far wandered from the common sentiments, feelings, and, indeed, *nature* of the species, could feel the force of arguments. For my part, when I shall be insensible of praise or blame, of any difference other than *utility* between virtue and vice, I shall then consider myself incapable of distinguishing the truth or force of any argument. And, therefore, taking all these things into view, I do not wonder that Mr. Owen *cannot* be convinced.

There was, notwithstanding, one good omen—one symptom of returning conviction in his last address. He qualified his denunciation of christianity with these remarkable words, "*As it is now taught.*" He did admit that I had given such an exhibition of the genius and spirit of christianity, as to make it appear most excellent. My opponent would not venture to attack the Bible christianity, but "*christianity as it is now taught.*" But even with this reservation I cannot admit this sweeping denunciation. Mr. Owen's social system has never been tested; but his materialist or atheistical system has been tested. France, revolutionary France, can tell the tale. Equality and liberty—no religion, no God, no hereafter. On the gates of the graveyards were inscribed, "*Death an everlasting sleep!*" The division of time into weeks of seven days, because it was of no human origin, became obnoxious to the materialists; and nothing short of an indiscriminate obliteration of every vestige of christianity, even to new-modifying the divisions of time, would satiate their deadly antipathy against everything like religion. Paris, in 1789, under the domination of the infamous Robespierre and his brethren, is a pretty good example of the tendency of the *no praise, no blame* system; and an admirable per contra to the assertion that christianity, in its present form, is the greatest curse that can happen to a nation. I think not so bad as atheism when it had the ascendant, Mr. Owen himself being judge.

Christianity has its direct and its indirect influences upon society. The direct or the reflex light of this holy religion affects almost every man in the region where it shines. It shines into the hearts of some, and in their lives it is reflected as from a mirror upon all around. And thus some are *christianized*, more are *moralized*, and all are, in some good degree, *civilized* by its light. A single pious man in a village is a restraint upon the wickedness and profanity of all the villagers. I have known some instances, and have heard of others, where a general deterioration of morals has followed the death or removal of a good man out of a small town or neighborhood. There is a charm, there is an indescribable influence in the genuine fruits of christianity, which, when exhibited in living christians, the most abandoned are constrained to respect. Hence an increase of genuine christians is one of the greatest national blessings—if, indeed, it be a truth that *righteousness exalteth a nation.*

But, says Mr. Owen, where is the christian now living whose whole life is not in direct contradiction to his professions? Christianity certainly is highly eulogized in this challenge; so excellent that it condemns in every point the best man living? By this appeal to our modesty, Mr. Owen has prevented us from pointing to any one present, and he would not believe, upon any testimony, anything favorable of the absent living. We shall then have to go to the dead. I have, then, just lately heard, that in this city two very aged christians recently died, both members of the Methodist church, in whose house we now meet. The one had been sixty years, and the other forty, professors of the christian religion—both of the most unexceptionable reputation; living proofs of the excellency of the religion which they professed, and conformed to it in temper and behavior. But after thus giving a new sort of "*argumentum ad hominem*," or "*ad modestiam*," Mr. Owen is ready to claim all the men of large souls, of great minds, as of his creed, while we have not one—no, not one who lives up to the christian religion. I fear Mr. Owen is, in this respect, of that jaundiced or distempered eye to which everything appears discolored. There is a malady called *hysteria*, corporeal and mental too. Some of those laboring under a real mental *hysteria*, cherish their hallucinations until at last they imagine that demonstration itself is not half so clear as their wild conceptions. In this state of mind all arguments are thrown away. It is much more difficult to convince a man whose mind is in this morbid state, than it is to convince the most confirmed hypochondriac, that his legs are not made of glass, or that there is not some other peculiarity in his composition. But Mr. Owen will have all the sons of science, all the enlightened minds in the world, on his side of the question. Let him make out his list; we have ours ready; here it is (Mr. C. pointed to a manuscript). We are prepared to show that all the fathers of modern science, in fact, that all the men of profound erudition, and of mighty enterprise, are of the christian school. This, however, is no argument; but when Mr. Owen gives his cloud of witnesses, ours shall be forthcoming.

The most intelligent persons in Europe, Mr. Owen says, "are well aware that all religious mysteries and miracles are opposed to reason, and therefore abandon them to men who discard reason." Thus, by the *authority* of these "intelligent men" Mr. Owen would rebut all argument and demonstration. But we must have faith in Mr. Owen's testimony about these intelligent men; and hence Mr. Owen requires us to exercise *faith* in his mere assertion as the best weapon he can wield against the christian faith. I might tell Mr. Owen in the same loose style, that I believe that all the mysteries and miracles (meaning thereby the pretended miracles and artificial mysteries of popery), were all contrary to reason. But what of that? Will my arguing, or my proving that certain bank bills are counterfeits,

prove that all bank bills are counterfeits; and that there is not a genuine bank note? No, nor ever was, nor ever will be.

We want, moreover, to hear the *names* of some of these "*intelligent men.*" Perhaps they are the skeptics of France and Germany, and not an intelligent man among them. We must first agree that they are intelligent men, and then to refer this discussion to them as arbitrators before their verdict will be of any consequence. Mr. Owen may tell us we are "*insane,*" "*blind as moles,*" and that he sees like Argus; is sane, a sage, a philosopher, a reasoner, a logician, a standard of reason; and with the powerful artillery of such browbeating syllogisms, and with such egotistic demonstrations among the *vulgum pecus*, the common mass of society, who think that he who asserts most stoutly and arrogates most to himself is the hero, the logician, and the philosopher, he may obtain faith, confidence, and admiration. But the really intelligent would always discriminate between argument and assertion, between logic and calumny, between philosophy and egotism.

Were I to talk about *sanity of mind*, I would undertake to prove that every atheist under heaven is *insane;* and that there can be no greater proof of insanity than to hear a person say that there is no God. Such persons may, like other insane persons, be rational upon many other subjects. But by all the arguments, counting them one by one, by which any person is proved to be insane, I will engage logically to prove, that all atheists are insane. By atheists, here I mean those who oppose the being and government of God, after having heard and understood the terms and phrases used in the Holy Scriptures upon this subject.

Mr. Owen puts into the mouth of reason certain interrogatories, which, of course, his obsequious reason answers, just to suit him. This reason is more religious than Mr. Owen, for it acknowledges its Creator; and unreservedly complies with all his requisitions. "Reason would ask ten thousand questions *of this nature*," says he, "to not one of which could a rational answer be given." Yes, but Sir Isaac Newton's reason and Mr. Owen's reason are very different sorts of *matter*. What would convince the former would not convince the latter; and what would convince the latter would appear ridiculous in the eyes of the former. The secret is here, my friends, there is no *inconsistency* at all in Mr. Owen's system. For, you know, there can be nothing crooked unless there be something straight. Now Mr. Owen has a vast advantage over us christians; there is something straight in our system to which he can compare, and by which he can measure, and which will show all our aberrations; but there is nothing in his system by which we can measure, or to which we can compare any part of it. Everything with Mr. Owen is quite straight. If a child kill its mother, it is quite right, for it is according to nature; if it support and honor its mother, it is quite right, for it is according to nature or necessity. All things are straight;

that is, exactly conformable to necessity. Mr. Owen, then, has a system of straight lines, and nothing in it is crooked. There is no aberration from necessity, and, therefore, all is straight. There is then no inconsistency in Mr. Owen's scheme. I have but *one fault to it*, and that is, his measuring-rod is crooked itself; and while he thinks it is straight, he must inevitably be in an error in every comparison of measurement which he makes. A person who has a false standard, who calls a rule *straight* which is *crooked*, will err in every measurement. And so all his conclusions are false. If that be a straight line which makes everything straight to which it is applied, then is Mr. Owen's standard correct.

Mr. Owen, this morning, deeply lamented this weekly preaching institution; or, rather, that no person was permitted to reply. I should not care, provided it did not disturb the worship of a christian congregation, that every person will rise up in the midst of an assembly, and in good order make his objections to the christian religion. For my part I think, if we had a few such gentlemen as Mr. Owen, so privileged as to rise in congregations, calmly to interrogate or to oppose, it would tend much to confirm the christians, and to confute the skeptics, provided they would reason as my friend Mr. Owen reasons. Christianity, like its founder, never loved darkness. It never shunned light. But it would illy suit the peaceful worship of christian congregations to turn them into debating schools. There is a time for everything. But I think, after the results of the present discussion are appreciated and known, Mr. Owen will think it safer for his cause, that the preachers be permitted to proceed as usual in their weekly sermons.

I never saw the superiority of the evidences of christianity so fully exhibited as Mr. Owen's last speech has evinced. He presumed not to attack a single position in my long speech, although he promised to reply to it, and come to "*close quarters*" as soon as it should be brought to a close. A few general assertions, such as christianity is all fable, and every way pernicious, constitute the inventory of the whole of the magazine of Mr. Owen's logic against it. This eclaircissement fully proves Dr. Chalmers' position that there is nothing left after the argument for christianity is fairly stated, but a firm belief of it, or atheism.

Mr. Owen has said that I have made my defense of christianity to rest upon testimony alone, or that I have made christianity altogether a matter of faith. This is true, but not as Mr. Owen represents it. I do certainly contend that christianity is legitimately founded upon historic facts, and that it is properly a matter of belief. But I have done more than was necessary to be done; I have by one philosophic series of reasonings shown that no man philosophically or rationally can object to the christian religion; and that upon principles of reason he is compelled to assent to the divine truth of christianity. I know Mr. Owen intends to communicate an idea something like this: that I have conceded that a person cannot prove christianity to be divine,

upon principles of reason, and must make it altogether a matter of belief through a fatal necessity; and *faith*, passing for little else than *superstition* among skeptics, he thinks his cause pretty safe with the skeptics upon this representation of my defense. This is, then, not a correct statement in the meaning which he intends to convey. I have shown that if a person act rationally, upon principles of reason, they must assent to the truth and certainty of the christian religion, as supernatural and divine. I have called the argument based upon these principles a philosophic argument in the singular number, though comprising many distinct arguments, as the historic argument is one. I must call upon Mr. Owen to admit that I have produced one philosophic argument which he has not in one instance attempted to oppugn. He may call it by what name he pleases; but I am thoroughly convinced neither he nor any skeptic on the globe can shake it. I only have to regret that I was not opposed with earnestness and ability on this topic, because, then, I would have illustrated and confirmed it more fully. An attempt to refute it on the part of Mr. Owen, would be more compatible with the character of a truth-loving philosopher, than to hear such unfounded assertions as that "I am unprepared to discuss the evidences of christianity upon any other ground than that of testimony."

MR. OWEN'S TWENTY-FOURTH ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman—Mr. Campbell, as you heard, has just concluded, by desiring me to retract my assertion, that I have not heard from him one philosophic argument in support of the Christian religion. While he was speaking, I have again taxed my memory, and I cannot recollect one. I have no doubt, that he has adduced many arguments which he deems philosophic; but they do not appear so to me. My conviction is, that no philosophic argument, derived from facts to be understood by man, can be adduced in favor of any religion. And therefore, however acute Mr. C.'s mind may be; however much he may have read; yet, owing to the nature of the subject, he has not, and, in my mind, he cannot, bring one philosophic argument—one that is in accordance with facts—in support of christianity, or any other religion. I can only speak of arguments, according to the impressions they have made upon my mind.

But there was another point adverted to, which it seems quite necessary to explain. I did not, in the remotest degree, mean, by any expression which might have fallen from me to impeach Mr. C.'s disinterestedness. If I have done so, it would have been doing violence to my own feelings; because I know, from various sources, that both Mr. C. and his father have suffered by their disinterestedness in supporting what they have been compelled to believe to be a right view of christianity. I have not the remotest idea that Mr. C. has come forward, upon this occasion, with any interested motive.

When I terminated my part of the discussion, this morning, I was proceeding to show in detail the number of vices and crimes which

were prevalent in christian society, and which I mean to prove emanate directly from religion. But as the period for this discussion will now be very much limited, I shall avoid much of the detail which it was my intention to develop, and shall apply the remaining part of our time to effect the most important purposes. I was about to state the horrors of the Inquisition, as well as of the religious wars and massacres of many centuries, as emanating directly from different sects of different religions. But I shall not now take up your time with matters which many of you can readily bring to your recollection, but proceed to those which are more important in practice.

As circumstances now render it necessary that this discussion should be brought to a speedy termination, I must wave all minor points, and give you as much of the essence of the subject as time will permit, and come at once into the midst of it.

Mr. C., by his defense and manner of reasoning, shows that his mind has been formed altogether upon the notion that man is born with a will to think and to act, free as he chooses, upon all occasions, or that he possesses a free will—and that he is responsible for his thoughts and actions. All christendom, and all the world, have been trained, educated, and conformed in these notions, and in the practice which they necessarily engender. The christian, and all other religions, are founded on these notions. It was these notions alone, that made any religion necessary. They become necessary, as artificial means to check the enormous evils that the notions of man's free will and free agency were sure to produce in practice. But they have proved themselves incompetent to the task; and like every other attempt to counteract nature, they greatly increase the evil, and become, themselves, more injurious than the evil which they were introduced to check. In fact, upon the theory of free will and action in man, are founded not only all the religions of the earth, but all the governments, codes of laws, and customs, with all phraseology of all languages, creating thereby feelings, thoughts and actions of a peculiar cast, derived immediately from this origin, which extend their ramifications through every portion of the individual and through society, wherever man has yet been found.

It is, however, as we have proved by the twelve fundamental laws of human nature, an error more obvious, upon reflection, than the one universally received by all our ancestors, that the sun moved round the earth. Both errors were derived from the first impressions of our senses; but facts, subsequently acquired, demonstrate both impressions to be contrary to reason.

We see, then, that the notion of free will and action has given birth to all the religions, governments, laws, phraseology, customs and practices of mankind; and that it has, through these agencies, formed the mind and character of the whole human race. The existing ignorance, poverty, vice and suffering of mankind are all

directly chargeable upon the errors of free-will doctrines, acting through these mighty agencies.

It is the extraordinary deceptions produced on human nature, by being subjected, every moment of its existence, to the influences of this doctrine, that compel the most enlightened men of the age to acknowledge the impossibility of denying the truth of all the principles on which the doctrines of the formation of character are founded; and yet to say, that they are, at the same time, conscious that they must be governed, in their feelings, thoughts and actions, by their pre-received notions of free will. They cannot, of themselves, so thoroughly have they been imbued, through religion, government, laws, language and practice, with all the physical and mental influences arising from the notions of free will, ever afterward divest themselves of the feelings and habits which they generate. It is this which makes these men say, Our judgments are convinced; but in spite of ourselves, the feelings, which have by some means or other been formed within us, are opposed to our judgments. We are, therefore, constrained to think one way, and to act another—to act contrary to our judgments.

Now, my friends, this doctrine, the origin of all religions, governments, laws, institutions and practices, carries with it sin and misery, through the whole extent of its ramifications. It is destructive of sincerity, of affection, of confidence, of charity and of permanent prosperity and happiness, among the whole family of mankind. It is the direct cause, operating through these influences, that generates anger, irritation, and all the inferior passions and jealousies which are now so prevalent in human society. And until its influences, shall be withdrawn, the world will be filled, as heretofore, with contention and strife, and all evil, and peace and good-will can never enter among the habitations of men—and that charity which *thinketh no ill*, will be, as at present, unknown except in name.

Instead of this doctrine, which directly emanates from the ignorance and experience of the least experienced, and therefore the most ignorant, I place before you the laws of human life—the same which existed from the beginning, as they are to-day, and as I believe they will be forever.

They are laws which require not to *persuade* you to consent to act in obedience to them. Knowing them—understanding them in all their connections one with another, *they will* make so much real knowledge present to your mind, upon all occasions, that you will be *compelled* to act in obedience to their dictates, and you will always act right.

These twelve fundamental laws of human nature, or laws of life, are the only foundation for real virtue that man can discover.

They are complete in themselves, and need no aid from any doubtful authority. They are divine decrees, if ever decrees were divine; and they have now gone forth to the uttermost parts of the earth. They will, my friends, produce in due time, "peace on earth, and good-will to man."

[*Here Mr. Owen held up a copy of the twelve laws, which had just come from the printer.*]

If you could remember all I stated to you in the early part of this discussion, it would be unnecessary for me to rise again, or say one word more. But aware, as I am, that the subject is new to many; that very few, if any, can retain the remembrance of conclusions, which are the condensed results of forty years' reading, reflection and experience; I will endeavor to make these fundamental laws still more easy to be understood.

Mr. C. says, and I know he believes it, that I have not brought forward one argument against the christian religion. I want no other proof, that Mr. C. has looked at this casket, and seen only his own ideas reflected in it, being altogether unable to discover the spring and to open it.

Mr. C. says, I have advanced no argument to prove that religions are founded in ignorance. Here are twelve arguments, each one of which, when it shall be understood, is more than sufficient to lay the ax to the root of every religion, and of all the codes of law, that ever emanated from them. They do not send you to the dark ages, to look for authority that deserves the consideration of the better informed mind of the present day. These laws speak intelligibly to the understanding of all who have been trained to think and reflect. When these shall be understood, and taught to the rising generation, we need not tell them that they must be good boys and girls, or men and women; for they cannot possibly be otherwise.

They will be compelled by the strongest of all possible motives, a clear and distinct knowledge of their own interests and happiness, to act, at all times and upon all occasions, according to the perfect law of obedience—according to that law, which they must perceive and feel will secure their happiness.

It is, my friends, the full understanding of the twelve laws contained in so small a compass, that can alone make you, and your children, and your children's children, through innumerable generations, potters of the very highest class, in the formation of the characters of your descendants. You will, hence, discover how to mould human nature in a manner so superior to what has yet been done, as to become more perfect than the population of the world, in its present ignorant state, is prepared to suppose practicable.

You will know how to impress the minds of all your descendants with that pure charity of which I have spoken—that charity which thinketh no evil.

We shall have our minds so purged from all those inferior passions, jealousies and feelings which now distract the world, that we shall go straight forward to our object, seeing most distinctly what it is we all have to do. We shall then know how to form the most perfect mould, and to put the clay properly within it, and to finish it in the best manner. And will not this be an acquisition of great value?

A knowledge, however, of these laws, will not only lay the foundation for this charity in the hearts of all, but it will speedily enable us to discover the beauty of an intelligent existence in unison with all nature, when contrasted with the glare and fashion of an artificial life. We shall then not contest with each other who shall have the largest and most splendid house, the richest clothing, or the greatest variety of useless trappings of any kind.

We shall understand wherein the real, substantial, tangible happiness of life consists. We shall know that a nation trained in simplicity of manners—taught to acquire high intelligence, with regard to what constitutes real knowledge, and to possess the most charitable feelings toward the whole human race, will form that combination of circumstances, from which alone anything that deserves the name of happiness can be looked for.

Shall I now, in detail, unlock the casket for you? Shall I again go through the twelve laws, and enable you how to understand how each sentence applies directly to the subject of this discussion? There is not one sentence, or clause of a sentence, that does not apply to the questions intended to be solved at this meeting.

What does the casket disclose to us at its commencement? "That man, at birth, is ignorant of everything relative to his organization." And if this be true—and who doubts it?—surely for that organization, and its qualities, no individual can be justly made responsible. I ask Mr. C., and all who are present, whether any other conclusion can be adduced from this important fact? Whether any other conclusion would be rational? What, then, becomes of the imaginary notion, taught to our ancestors and to ourselves, that we are bad by nature? My friends, to say that man is culpably bad by nature, is an assertion not less untrue and absurd, than if I were to say that the sun is culpably bad by nature; for both have their origin from the same cause, whatever that cause may be. And that we are ignorant, at birth, of everything relative to our organization, is an eternal truth, depending solely upon facts obvious to every one: a law which came with us into existence, and which will remain until man shall cease to exist. It is no law of man's devising; but a law emanating from the same Eternal Source from whence all facts proceed.

The casket tells you, moreover, on its first opening, that man has not been permitted to create the slightest part of any of his natural propensities, faculties or qualities, physical or mental. And do you not know, my friends, that the infant, at birth, is the foundation of the man? Some will say that the infant, the original organization at birth, is the whole man; that he only requires time to grow; and that what he is at birth, he will be till death. I know the contrary, I know that it forms the foundation, but only the foundation, of the character of man. But I also know, if any unchangeable foundation be laid for a house, that whatever superstructure may be subsequently raised upon it, the foundation itself ought not to be blamed for any

imperfection it may possess, but the architect. And, my friends, although I do not agree with those philosophers, who take but a partial view of human nature, and who do not investigate all the facts for themselves, being content to receive them from others, and conclude that man is wholly formed by his education ; I do not agree with those other philosophers, who hold that the organization, at birth, is everything, and that education, or the circumstances in which it is placed, is a mere covering and deceptious garb, in the character of man. This organization is unquestionably a very important part of our nature ; and if we are to be made responsible for it, we ought to have had the forming of all its minute and general qualities for ourselves. It is surely irrational for any one to assert that after we have been compelled to receive our organization, which is the foundation and contains the germ of all our faculties, we should be held responsible for it. This is a notion wholly irreconcilable to common sense, and it is also exceedingly unfavorable to the formation of a superior character by a right education ; for it destroys all correct ideas upon the subject. There never can be any virtue in the world, so long as this error respecting the nature of man shall continue—so long as men are made to believe that they ought to be held responsible for that over which they have no control. If we really desire to improve man, and to form a virtuous, intelligent and happy state of society, we must make haste to discard notions so directly opposed to common sense.

My friends, this first law gives us a distinct knowledge of what we are, when we first come into the world. Here we are ushered into existence, utterly unconscious of anything appertaining to ourselves. Then what follows ? how is the remainder of our character made up? Let us see.

I request your best attention to this part of the subject, for all our subsequent reasoning will be erected on this foundation ; for this is not the wordy wandering you have been accustomed to hear, week after week, during your lives, and to which you may listen, or not, and be as wise in the former case as the latter. No, this part of our subject is fraught with consequences of deep import to every human being. Every word of it, when understood, will be found invaluable for future practice.

The second law is "that no two infants, at birth, have yet been known to possess precisely the same organization ; while the physical, mental, and moral differences between all infants are formed without their knowledge or will."

No two infants have ever been known to be alike. This is a most important conclusion. It lays the foundation for virtues in the human character, which no other knowledge can ever form, or make permanent and ever active. It is the only knowledge on which genuine charity can be formed to apply to every individual of the human race, and it is abundant to effect this object. A knowledge of this single fact, when rightly understood, will so form our minds,

as to compel us to be charitable to all mankind without any exception.

[*Here Mr. Campbell rose and remarked that he would beg leave to suggest that these laws should not be commented on more than* ELEVEN *times.*"]

Mr. Owen resumed—I find the expounding of these laws, and bringing them to bear on the practical conduct of mankind, is more than my friend, Mr. Campbell can bear. Well, you see, my friends, this second law is quite sufficient to overset all the arguments of my friend, Mr. Campbell, it is evident he begins to feel its extensive influence.

Assuredly, if no two infants are born alike, but receive from that Power which gives them existence, qualities which differ in their strength and combinations, there ought to be, in justice to these individuals, if they are to be considered responsible beings, a different religion for every child that is born. Is not this true? If they are organized differently, can we with one atom of rationality render them amenable to the same laws. I do say, that to act justly by the human race, if a religion be necessary for any one individual, a different religion is equally necessary for every other individual of the human family; and that these religions must necessarily be as various and as multiform, as are the individual organizations of our species; and, also, that these countless religions should be so modified, as to adapt themselves precisely to the strength or weakness of the faculties with which each individual has been endowed.

Now, my friends, I *could touch* Mr. Campbell again and again with these simple, plain facts; but they are so decisive of the great questions before us, that I am afraid of exhausting his patience and good feelings. I will take compassion on him, therefore, and proceed to the third law. It is, "That each individual, is placed, at birth, without his knowledge or consent, within circumstances, which, acting upon his peculiar organization, impress the general character of those circumstances upon the infant, child or man. Yet that the influence of those circumstances is, to a certain degree, modified by the peculiar organization of each individual."

Now we come to another part of the subject, which is most interesting to all, and which has not been explained sufficiently to give those unacquainted with these facts in the formation of the human character, a right understanding of its importance in the every-day practice of life.

It is not only that all infants are made, by the constitution of their respective natures, to differ from each other, and probably to differ in every one of their senses, as well as in their general organization; but that these infants, after their birth, are placed in circumstances so different, that their characters must be often formed on models having little or no resemblance to each other, frequently, indeed, the very opposite. For as there are no two infants born alike, neither is it in the power of man to place two infants under the same identical

circumstances, even when they appear to be the most alike. And therefore, my friends, you not only require a different religion for every individual, in consequence of their organic difference at birth, but you also require a separate and distinct religion for each, according to the various kinds of circumstances or temptations in which each of these individuals may be placed, from their birth to death.

My friends, there never were two infants, who for one day, or even for an hour, have been placed under precisely the same circumstances. Now only look at the cruelty and injustice, in this respect, of the doctrines of rewards and punishments of all religions. A moment's conviction will convince any intelligent mind, that no two can be placed under the same circumstances, after birth. To be so placed, they must be born at the same moment—open their eyes and see the light precisely the same direction ; whatever impressions are made upon the one, must be made upon the other, and in precisely the same order and sequence of strength. Now this is utterly impracticable. And, therefore, the notion that any human being is the legitimate object of reward or punishment, on account of the circumstances in which he has been placed without his control, knowledge, or consent, is an error only to be accounted for from the irrational impressions made upon us by our ancestors, relative to the real character of human nature.

We well know, from the general history of the world, that when infants are born, they must become men according to the country and district in which they were reared ; that they must be influenced by the circumstances existing in that particular country or district. They cannot be influenced by that which they do not know and cannot feel. Therefore, as infants and children have no power whatever to direct or control these circumstances, no religion can be made to apply to them without the greatest injustice. And as it is demonstrated that children and men are the effects of their organization and external circumstances ; that these combined operations form them to be whatever they are, at every moment of their time : no religion can be applicable to beings whose characters are so formed.

It is from this view of the subject, that I have said, again and again, that it is most irrational to treat children or men in the manner in which we have heretofore done, and to consider them responsible, as the cause of their characters ; when, from their nature, they have been, and must continue to be, the effects of combined causes over which they have no control.

But, my friends, although it were possible to impress children with precisely the same circumstance, at and from their birth, the variety of their original organization would make a material and very important difference. For the circumstances operating upon, and influencing the mind of, one child, would create a very different impression from those made upon another ; and yet the child itself is in no

degree the cause of this difference. And therefore, again, none of the religions of the world can apply with justice to a being so formed and matured.

Well, let us look at the next argument against all religions, contained in the fourth law. I stated to you, that "No infant has the power of deciding at what period of time, or in what part of the world it shall come into existence, of whom it shall be born, in what particular religion it shall be trained to believe, or by what other circumstances, it shall be surrounded from birth to death."

Now, my friends, I wish you to remark, as I proceed, that each of these laws, by itself even taken separately and distinctly from their natural and necessary connection and dependence one upon the other, is much more than sufficient to refute all my friend's fallacies.

This fourth law is so full of matter and meaning, that to do it ample justice, and direct your attention fully to all its important physical, intellectual, and moral considerations, many days would be necessary, instead of the hour or two now left for me, to explain many other parts of the subject equally important. But as the discussion, at the request of the moderators, must terminate to-night, and the evening is rapidly advancing upon us, I will endeavor, before it becomes dark, to place before you as many facts as will hereafter beneficially occupy your minds for reflection; and refer to the early part of my statement, for a more full explanation of this law, and hasten to elucidate some of the remaining.

The next in order is the fifth law, viz: "That each individual is so created, that, when young, he may be made to receive impressions to produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and to retain them with great tenacity."

My friend, Mr. Campbell, is a most striking living example of the overwhelming influence of this law of our nature. He has been organized as we behold him; for which he has neither merit nor demerit. He was afterward trained and educated in a particular part of Europe, and subsequently in this country, and placed under circumstances by which he has been forced to believe in his particular views of the christian religion, and by which we all perceive he is now influenced. He has been thus influenced to his peculiar conduct by the same general laws of our nature, that have compelled me to act as I have done, and which govern the birth, life, and death of every being that has yet been born.

You see, then, my friends, that through this law of our nature, we may force any child to become a Mahometan, a Christian, or an idolater, a Jew, a Quaker, or a cannibal. The child is a perfectly passive piece of clay, to be moulded, by those around him, into any shape they please. And then the greater or less tenacity with which the ideas given to it will be retained, depends upon a great many circumstances, as much beyond the individual's control, as was his original organization.

This is that law of our nature, which, when thoroughly under-

stood, will enable you to become potters, to enable you, through an accurate knowledge of it, to place your children in any mould, more or less perfect, according as you may have been better or worse informed upon the subject, or more or less expert in the practice. None of the religions in the world, however, can be applicable to a being whose character is thus formed necessarily by his nature and condition in life.

The sixth law states, that "Each individual is so created, that when young, he must believe according to the strongest conviction that is made on his mind and other faculties; while his belief, in no case depends upon his will."

In commenting on this sixth law, Mr. Campbell entangles himself and his audience in the mazes of metaphysical disquisition. I saw at once that his notions regarding this law were confused by the notions early forced into his mind, relative to free will and action in man; and became, therefore, merely metaphysical. But this law promulgates facts which are either true or false. Now, it is a fact, that man can believe according to his will, or that he cannot. Now, let all of you endeavor to recollect something which you believe; and then try if you have power sufficient over your will to disbelieve it, even for a few minutes. Why, my friends, it is contrary to this law of our nature, which cannot be made to change its character at the bidding of any individual, however learned. I perceive you discover that by your utmost efforts you cannot accomplish it. You might, indeed, as well attempt, by the bare exercise of your volition, to bring down the sun from the firmament, as to disbelieve what you have been compelled to believe, until a more powerful conviction shall be made upon your minds. Try again, then, and see if you can believe, for ever so short a period, what former convictions now compel you to disbelieve. You find the one as impracticable as the other.

The same irresistible law of your nature governs and controls you in your disbelief as well as your belief. We have no metaphysics here; we discard them as useless for the real happiness of life, and unworthy a discussion of this character; for we ought to proceed entirely upon those facts which all can examine for themselves, and which change not — facts which can be investigated with all their attendant circumstances, at all times, by all men, who desire to acquire a knowledge of the truth for the love of truth.

From a hint I have just received from my friend, Mr. Campbell, I perceive he is again becoming very impatient under this obvious exposition of a few plain facts; so plain, indeed, and so essential for present purposes, that he feels no reply, but a metaphysical one, can be made to them.

I did not promise, as Mr. Campbell appears to suppose, that I would conclude in an hour; but I stated to Mr. Campbell that I was willing to rest all the points in controversy between us upon this single position, as upon it the whole controversy depended: Is there an excep-

tion to be found, throughout the whole human family, to the universal application of this law? Is there a single individual who, by the fiat of his own will, can believe, or disbelieve contrary to previous conviction made upon his mind?

But, my friends, we have all been trained from infancy in the opposite notions. Mr. Campbell has been trained in them—and it is therefore no wonder that all our minds have been forced to become irrational.

The notion that our will has power over our belief or disbelief, is the principal source from which emanate the mistaken notions, the injurious feelings, the malignant passions, the want of universal charity, and the vicious conduct of men. This subject, my friends, to be fully developed, so as to make a proper impression upon your minds, would also take many days to elucidate and trace to all its important practical results. It is this kind of knowledge, deeply affecting the well-being of each, and the happiness of all, that this little casket contains. It is true, this knowledge, valuable as it is, has laid buried for several thousand years, and no one suspected its intrinsic practical worth, to induce a sufficient search for its discovery. It has been covered with so much rubbish, that it required forty years' daily exertion, before I could discover it, and make it sufficiently known and attractive to draw public attention to its real merits. The question I have put to you, taken out of this casket, and which no one can answer, is decisive of the result of the whole debate; of the futility and uselessness of all religions, and whether or not they are derived from any other source than the ignorance of mankind.

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWENTY-FOURTH REPLY.

Mr. Chairman—Mr. Owen has no good reason to complain of the time fixed for bringing this discussion to a close. He first suggested the idea that two hours would be sufficient for his reply to my long speech. He seems now to act with a little of that art of which I did not think him capable. And what new matter has he now to offer? Since opening his casket, nothing has appeared but the same old twelve positions, facts, or laws, as you please to call them. If he have anything new to offer, why does he not now offer it? True, indeed, I ought to except the abusive document, which he read this morning; and some remarks made upon the Mahometan religion. This latter I neglected, or forgot to notice in my last speech. The establishment and progress of this religion all the world knows. No greater contrast can be found in any book upon any subject than the contrast between the establishment and progress of Mahometanism and christianity. The ruffian exploits of a crew of pirates, or a banditti of highwaymen, might as justly be contrasted with the peaceful march of a missionary family, or of the almoners of a christian community, in distributing their charities among a suffering population, as to compare the lustful, vengeful, avaricious exploits of Mahomet and the

Koran, with Jesus, the Messiah, and his Apostles. While the language of the christian teachers was, "Glory to God in the highest—peace on earth, and good-will among men;" that of the marauding false prophet was, "*Dogs, you know your option, the Koran, tribute, or the sword.*" Here lies the volume. [*Mr. Campbell pointing to the Koran.*] Here is the Mahometan Bible. I have examined it with at least as much care as most skeptics do the Bible; and while it admits the mission of Moses, Jesus, and the Apostles, and then directly proves the truth of christianity, as the institution of Jesus Christ, its doctrines, and, as far as they have a supernatural idea in them, are evidently stolen from the two testaments, as is the English word *philanthropy* from the Greek *philanthropia*.

But the Koran proves the divine authorship of the New Testament as clearly as ever did accomplishment prove the truth of prophesy; for in the seven letters addressed by Jesus Christ to the seven congregations in Asia, written by John while in Patmos, the setting of the Sun of Righteousness, or the extinguishment of the light of christianity, in that country, is threatened as consequent upon the progression of the dereliction of christian principle and practice then appearing among the dissolute Asiatics. All the world, Jewish, christian, and skeptical, know that the Mahometan superstition is a vile imposition, and not in any one feature comparable to christianity. Counter testimony, and every sort of testimony, can be adduced against the pretensions of the Koran; and both literally and symbolically is the rise and progress of the imposture portrayed in the Apocalypse.

Mr. Owen has told us how long the contents of his casket have lain hid. For four thousand years anterior, and two thousand years subsequent to the christian religion, have these jewels been buried. How Mr. Owen happened to disinter them is the question. Was it never known before the year of favor, 1829, that no child chose its parentage, nor the place and circumstances of its nativity? Was it never known, before Mr. Owen descried it, that children are much influenced by the circumstances of their childhood, and by the example of their parents? These burnished gems, now made brilliant by being changed from manuscript to *print* [*Mr. Owen had them printed yesterday*], have been like the twelve Apostles; the twelve lions on which the throne of Solomon stood; the twelve foundations of the New Institution, now read twelve times, destined to great honor and glory. As Mr. Owen has read them so often, I hope I may be indulged to read them once; and that I may make them more famous by my reading them, I will show the whole extent of their latitude, and I think Mr. Owen himself will be indebted to me for the liberal and extensive construction which I am about to give them. I will show that they are so large and so liberal as to engross almost every animal in the creation within their lawful jurisdiction. But for the sake of trial and proof, I will only try how they will suit one species

of quadrupeds. Mr. Owen has told you twelve times that they will exactly suit for bipeds.

THE TWELVE FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF BRUTAL NATURE,

On which Robert Owen bases a change of society that will form an entire new state of existence.

1. That a goat, at its birth, is ignorant of everything relative to its own organization, and that it has not been permitted to create the slightest part of any of its natural propensities, faculties, or qualities, physical or mental.

2. That no two kids, at birth, have yet been known to possess precisely the same organization; while the physical, mental, and moral differences between all kids are formed without their knowledge or will.

3. That each individual kid is placed, at birth, without its knowledge or consent, within circumstances, which, acting upon its peculiar organization, impress the general character of those circumstances upon the infant kid and goat; yet that the influence of those circumstances is, to a certain degree, modified by the peculiar natural organization of each individual goat.

4. That no kid has the power of deciding at what period of time or in what part of the world it shall come into existence, of what goat it shall be born, what particular tricks it shall be trained to, or by what other circumstances it shall be surrounded from birth to death.

5. That each individual goat is so created, that, when young, it may be made to receive impressions, to produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and to retain them with great tenacity.

6. That each individual goat is so created that he must feel according to the strongest impressions that can be made on its feelings, and other faculties, while its feelings in no case depend upon its will.

7. That each individual is so created that it must like that which is pleasant to it, or that which produces agreeable sensations on individual organization, and it must dislike that which creates in it unpleasant or disagreeable sensations; while it cannot discover, previous to experience, what those sensations shall be.

8. That each individual goat is so created, that the sensations made upon its organization, although pleasant and delightful at their commencement, and for some duration, generally become, when continued beyond a certain period without change, disagreeable and painful. While, on the contrary, when a too rapid change of sensations is made on its organization, it dissipates, weakens, and otherwise injures its physical, intellectual and moral powers and enjoyments.

9. That the highest health, the greatest progressive improvements, and the most permanent happiness of each individual goat, depend, in a great degree, upon the proper cultivation of all its physical, intellectual and moral faculties and powers from infancy to maturity, and upon all these parts of its nature being duly called into action at their proper periods, and temperately exercised according to the strength and capacity of the individual goat.

10. That the individual goat is made to possess and to acquire the *worst* character, when its organization at birth has been compounded of the most inferior propensities, faculties and qualities of its common nature; and when so organized, it has been placed, from birth to death, amidst the most vicious or worst circumstances.

11. That the individual goat is made to possess and to acquire a medium character, when its original organization has been created *superior*, and when the circumstances which surround it from birth to death produce continued *vicious* or *unfavorable* impressions; or when its organization has been formed of *inferior* materials, and the circumstances in which it has been placed from birth to death are of a character to produce *superior* impressions only; or when there has been some mixture of *good* and *bad* qualities in the original organization, and when it has also been placed, through life, in varied circumstances of *good* and *evil*. This last compound has been hitherto the common lot of all goats.

12. That each individual goat is made the most superior to its species, when its original organization has been compounded of the best proportions, of the best ingredients of which goat nature is formed, and when the circumstances which surround it from birth to death are of a character to produce only superior impressions; or, in other words, when the circumstances, or laws, institutions and customs in which it is placed, are all in unison with its nature.

Mr. Owen has told you that he believes not in a *spiritual* system, consequently none of these laws are founded upon anything *spiritual* in man. Now as his laws are all built upon the hypothesis that man is a pure animal, if it should ever appear to Mr. Owen that there is a spiritual system, he must add a few laws to his code. I will, therefore, add a few laws to them, which will, indeed, exclude the goat and every other animal from being a legitimate subject of them. The four following laws are just as plain, as true, and as palpable as the first one. As these are the beginning of a new series for Mr. Owen, I will call my first the thirteenth "law of human nature."

13. That man has aspirations after knowledge, which would not cease, did he know and perfectly comprehend every particle of matter in the globe, in the solar system, in the universe, with all its laws, properties, and modifications; and never can he feel so well pleased with his acquisitions of knowledge as to fix a period to his inquiries.

14. That man has a taste for society which the largest and most

accomplished society which could exist cotemporaneously with himself cannot gratify.

15. That he has desires for happiness which no circumstances on earth can satisfy; and that these desires are commensurate with infinite objects which the present state of existence cannot present to him.

16. That when he has formed the best conceptions of himself which all earth-born opportunities present, he feels himself *painfully* ignorant of every grand fact connected with the origin of his existence and of every grand result involving his own ultimate destiny.

These are a sample of the additions which I hope Mr. Owen will yet see necessary to append to his original twelve. No sheep or goat can dispute its right or title to any of these *four*.

I would also prefix two to his animal code, as also prefatory to the original twelve. These would be:

1. That the first man was not born; and

2. That man, at his birth, is the child of somebody, and by nature is dependent upon that somebody for subsistence, for his language, modes of thinking, and for a majority of all the peculiarities of his constitution.

But before taking my final leave of the new Code of Twelve, I must give Mr. Owen a critique upon the sixth, which he has so often thrown in our way. He has often said, prove one of the twelve to be erroneous, and he will abandon all of them. That the sixth is so, I hope the following critique will show:

1. The first and fundamental principles of our nature which excite to action are our appetites and affections. These instinctive faculties we have in common with all animals. A high excitement of these we call passion.

2. Next to these is that class of powers by which we obtain all our simple original ideas; into which, as elementary principles, is ultimately resolvable all our knowledge, viz: sensation, perception, memory, reason, and consciousness. Now, although these faculties are affected, or called into action, when their objects are presented; yet, in many important cases, it is quite optional whether the objects shall be presented or not.

3. In the next place, the use or operation of these faculties for the acquisition of knowledge is dependent on our volition, viz: recollecting, reflecting, imagining, reasoning, judging.

4. Lastly, the combined or separate influence of our appetites, affections, passions, and judgments, determine our wills, and produce those volitions which terminate in action.

Inferences.—Hence it follows that every action of our lives is naturally subjected to our judgments; which are, or ought to be, the combined and ultimate results of all our intellectual powers. We say our actions ought to be such; first, because we possess these powers; second, because we are instinctively impelled to desire

and will our own happiness or gratification: and, third, because we are accountable to our Creator and Benefactor for the use we make of our powers for our own profit and his good pleasure, which is the happiness of his rational creatures, for whose sakes he has created all things.

Again, in classifying these powers in relation to their peculiar and appropriate objects, we denominate them sensitive, intellectual, and moral; which last distinction does not mean a new class of powers not included in the two previous classes, but only those of thinking and acting with respect to law, and of the law itself by which we are to be governed. These are the powers of reasoning, judging, and believing. Hence faith or belief is not the proper and immediate effect of volition, but of our reason and judgment duly exercised upon testimony. We, therefore, cannot believe at will, or by virtue of an act of volition without evidence, any more than we can, by an act of our will, see without light; nevertheless, it would be absurd to affirm that we see by necessity—that our sight or perception of objects in no case depended upon, or was influenced by, our will. The truth is, that although we can neither believe nor see what or when we please, yet both our believing and seeing are, in many very important cases, dependent upon our volition.

Then, it may be asked, What is it that determines our will to investigate? Answer: Duty, curiosity, or interest. But, whatever may be the motive, still it is evident, that being excited to will to investigate, our will has a proper and rational influence upon our belief, just as it has upon our power of seeing, or upon our sight.

Upon the whole, to suppose that a rational creature acts without motive, is the same as to say that it acts irrationally, or without reason. And to assert that because it acts rationally it acts necessarily, and, therefore, is neither praise nor blame-worthy, is contrary to reason itself; for every man's reason condemns him when he acts irrationally, and approves or acquits him when he acts rationally. Therefore, Mr. Owen's sixth law is manifestly erroneous, being in direct contradiction to a fundamental law of rational nature.

Again, what is natural must be right; if not, what is the standard of right? or, if nature be wrong, who or what shall correct it, seeing it produces all things as they are? Shall the effect correct the cause? or shall the cause, that is, nature, correct itself, and, therefore, be wiser and better than itself? Therefore, if things be as nature produced them, are they not as they ought to be? But if not, who can better them, seeing that everything is the effect of nature, and that the effect cannot correct or rectify the cause?

But if it be supposed that things are in a disordered and preternatural state, how came they into such a state? For, seeing the creature has no influence either upon its constitution or circumstances, according to law 1, 2, how could it change for the worse? Or, being deteriorated in its nature and circumstances, having no power

over them, how can it change for the better; having no independent, inherent, self-determining power?

Nature, then, being equally the author both of our nature and circumstances, who can change either of them, but the author? But, are we naturally constituted capable of improving both our nature and circumstances? How can this be, if we came into existence, at first, in an adult state? For then we were the creatures of circumstances, and, as everything must necessarily act as it is—that is, according to its nature and circumstances—therefore, we could never better our conditions, being limited by our nature and circumstances. But if there be a principle in our nature by which we can rise superior to our nature and circumstances (and such there must be, if we can ameliorate our condition in both these respects, as Mr. Owen's system pretends), then surely his display of the fundamental laws of our nature are essentially deficient, inasmuch as they nowhere develop this principle.

Having now laid my objections fairly before Mr. Owen, and that he may be induced not to pass them by as formerly, I will sit down, that he may attack and remove my objections if he can.

MR. OWEN'S TWENTY-FIFTH ADDRESS.

My friends, Mr. Campbell very naturally wishes that I should follow his lead in this discussion: that is, that I should reply to his metaphysical argument, and leave these facts, which can alone throw any real light upon the subject, and which he ought to have prepared himself to refute; and thus involve myself in a debate which would only darken knowledge and confound your understandings. Now all this is perfectly natural on the part of Mr. Campbell. But I wish to set myself right with this assembly before we separate, in consequence of some of Mr. Campbell's observations upon my supposed opinion on the subject of Deity. I have never denied the existence of a Deity. I distinctly and most pointedly gave my reasons for what I believe on this subject. I stated what I believe to be the whole amount of our knowledge in regard to those things which are called Divine; but I will not affirm or deny that for which we have not sufficient facts to enable us to form correct or rational ideas.

Now, my friends, you may be sure that, in a discussion of this character, the last expedient an opponent can resort to, is an attempt to ridicule his antagonist's argument. To this dernier resort my friend, Mr. Campbell, has been driven. But the shafts of Mr. Campbell's ridicule have been very harmless: they struck pointless, and without the least effect on the mark at which they were aimed; and why? Because the casket was too well tempered and too highly polished to be penetrable by such feeble missiles. But if ridicule were to be recognized as a fair weapon in religious controversial warfare, only consider the game that lies before me; only imagine for a

moment how the whole christian scheme could be cut up and rendered almost too ridiculous for ridicule itself. I have, however, too much regard for your feelings, and for the importance of the subject under discussion, to pursue this course. On my side of the question, I defy ridicule; for, as you perceive, none can be successfully made to bear upon even one of the fundamental laws of nature, on the accuracy or truth of which the real merits of this discussion will be ultimately discovered to rest. And this is the true cause why they have so grievously nonplused Mr. Campbell. But could I so far forget the magnitude of the cause I have undertaken to advocate, as to resort for arguments to ridicule, and thereby unnecessarily wound your feelings, every one knows how easy it would be to use this weapon to expose the pretensions of any, and of all religion. But this is a proceeding to which I have no inclination to resort; when the improvement of the human race, in the reformation of its character and general practice, is the subject before me. My object here, upon the present occasion, is not to obtain a personal victory over any man or any portion of my fellows; to me such a victory would be of the least possible estimation. But it is to promulgate truth for its own value, and for the incalculable practical benefits that must accrue to the race of man from its development. This is a consideration with me beyond all others. This, my friends, is my only object. Were you to give me your whole state—nay, the whole United States—I would consider the gift as valueless, compared with the discovery of one truth of such a character as will penetrate the understanding of all men; arrest their present irrational career, and induce them to adopt a practice which shall make themselves and their posterity happy.

Mr. Campbell has given you his views and reasonings upon this sixth law of our nature, but they amount to nothing. He did not take up the position which is here laid down. This position is, that each individual is so created, that he must believe according to the strongest impression that is made upon his feelings and other faculties, while his belief in no case depends upon his will. This is a clear and distinct position, and leaves no room for a metaphysical retreat.

Mr. Campbell rose and said—There is no metaphysical subterfuge in me. I contend that I have met the position fairly. The clause I objected to is this: "That belief in no case depends upon will."

Mr. Owen.—Well, gentlemen, I will bring this matter to a speedy issue. If Mr. Campbell can adduce a single instance wherein his belief depends upon his will, I will give up the whole question.

[*Here Mr. Owen waited some time for Mr. Campbell's reply. Mr. Campbell could not then make any.*]

My friends, there is no power that can coerce a man to believe contrary to the convictions upon his mind. The change can be effected only by producing evidence that shall appear to him still

stronger; and then often against his will, he is obliged to change his belief. The cause of truth is thus gained.

We will, however, proceed to the seventh law of our nature, viz: "That each individual is so created, that he must like that which is pleasant to him, or that which produces agreeable sensations on his individual organization; and he must dislike that which creates in him unpleasant or disagreeable sensations; while he cannot discover, previous to experience, what those sensations shall be."

I have placed upon record the very important consequences of this law of our nature. It will have a weighty influence on the future destinies of man; it will change all the present family relations of life; it will create a new order of existence, as much superior to the present, as light is to darkness. But I will now trespass no longer on your patience, except to remark, that Mr. Campbell, when speaking of this very law, as applicable to marriage, gave quite a different color to the argument from what he was justified in doing from anything I have ever written or said. He endeavored to make it appear, no doubt from previous misconceptions in his mind, that I intended to encourage prostitution, as it is now understood and practiced in general throughout society.

Why, my friends, it is the infraction of this very law of our nature that has produced all the vices and evils attendant upon prostitution. It is the infraction of this law that has produced a vicious and most degrading connection between the sexes, unavoidable over the world. I wish to withdraw all the causes which render prostitution necessary and unavoidable, and to propose the means by which a society may be formed, in which chastity alone shall be known. Let me hear no more, therefore, from any quarter, of the vulgar jargon that I advocate this law of our nature from a desire to increase the vice and misery which the infraction of this law has made everywhere to abound; and when I well know there are already so many dreadful evils created by prostitution as threaten to overwhelm the health and happiness of the population of all countries.

No, my friends, I would not have traveled to and fro, sacrificing my ease, expending my substance, exposing my health, and risking my life, were it not with the intention of improving, and highly improving, too, the whole condition of man. What motive, short of this, could have induced me to adopt the course which I have so long pursued, or to persevere in that course? Therefore, my friends, listen no more to such mistaken notions relative to my views and intentions on this most important subject. Such misrepresentations, derived from the ignorant multitude, are unworthy of repetition by Mr. Campbell; unworthy of the cause he supports, and of the magnitude of the interests which we have met to discuss. This law of our nature, when it shall be understood and properly applied to practice, will put an end to the cause which renders prostitution, under your present errors, unavoidable.

The eighth law of our nature is: "That each individual is so created that the sensations made upon his organization, although pleasant and delightful at their commencement, and for some duration, generally become, when continued beyond a certain period without change, disagreeable and painful. And when a too rapid change of sensations is made on his organization, it dissipates, weakens, and otherwise injures his physical, intellectual, and moral powers and enjoyments."

In this law is to be found the foundation of all excellence in human conduct. The desire of happiness is a principle coeval with life and the most powerful feeling to stimulate to action in human nature. And by this law, and the one immediately succeeding it (the ninth), we shall discover that temperance in the enjoyment and exercise of all our faculties, according to their different degrees of strength, is that habit by which alone the highest point of happiness is to be attained.

The tenth law is, that the individual is made to possess and acquire the *worst* character, when his organization at birth has been compounded of the most inferior propensities and faculties of our common nature—and when so organized, he has been placed from birth to death amidst the most vicious or worst circumstances.

My friends, this is one of those laws that will instruct you in your new art as *fathers*, as soon as you begin to undertake the task; it will show you what you have to do for your infants, your children, and your youth. It will show you, that while you permit them to be surrounded with vicious circumstances, they must receive vitiating impressions from them; and that in the formation of the characters of your children, such of them as have been so unfortunate as to receive a vicious organization, ought to be the objects of your especial compassion and kindness; and that they have a just and rational claim upon you for fourfold more care and attention in forming them in the most perfect mould, than such of your children as have been blessed with a more perfect natural organization are entitled to receive at your hands. This law, my friends, lays the foundation also for much good feeling and genuine charity. In fact each of these laws speak peace to you and all mankind—they all concur to lay the foundations of charity deeper and still deeper within us, and to exterminate every germ of unkind feeling. They are, indeed, a perfect system of moral laws, and all of them being derived from the constitution of man, as it has been ascertained to be, will, when once understood, recognized, and adopted by society, irresistibly enforce their precepts upon the hearts and the understandings, and direct all the actions of man. Their effect will be as certain upon the individual, as are the effects of physical laws in the progress of plants from the seed to the fruit, and the full formed tree, or in any other branch of vital economy. Now, my friends, under the wholesome and beneficent government of these laws, you will not, as at present, have to grope your way in perpetual and anxious uncertainty. When

you begin to form the character of a human being you may calculate upon the result with the same undoubting confidence which the mathematician feels when he begins to calculate upon known and certain *data*. If the work be correctly performed, there can be no mistake in the result. It will be a sort of *moral Rule of Three* calculation, which might perhaps be stated thus: *As* the *organization* of the individual is to his *circumstances, so* will be the *character* compounded out of both.

This change in society will abrogate two-thirds of our present vocabulary—the hacknied phrases arising from our deceptive notions of *free will*, will be exploded; they convey impressions only of error to the mind—and in our new and rational state of existence, not a single harsh epithet, or unkind or censorious expression, in which all languages now abound, will receive admission. And why? Because there will be no harsh, malignant, uncharitable feelings to be expressed. Hatred and anger will be unknown, for we shall have peace within us, and all will be peace around us.

We come now, my friends, to the eleventh law of our nature: "That the individual is made to possess and acquire a medium character, when his original organization has been created superior, and when the circumstances which surround him from birth to death, produce continual *vicious* and *unfavorable* impressions. Or, when his organization has been formed of *inferior* materials, and the circumstances in which he has been placed from birth to death, are of a character to produce superior impressions only. Or, when there has been some mixture of superior and inferior qualities in the original organization, and when it has also been placed through life in varied circumstances of good and evil. This last compound has been hitherto the common lot of mankind."

My friends, this eleventh law is a mirror to all of you. You have all been forced to acquire this medium character. You are none of you so bad, nor any of you so good, as you might have been formed to be. And why are all of you now, as well as all christendom, and indeed the inhabitants of every other portion of the globe, only of a very ordinary medium character? It is because of the universal first impressions forced upon mankind in favor of the doctrine of free will. These impressions, which commenced in times beyond our knowledge, and have always been the fruitful source of error in the thoughts, feelings, and actions of man, originated in the dark ages, when science was unknown, when men knew but few facts, and those few imperfectly. These false notions were, probably, received into the human mind at the time it imbibed its undoubting belief for ages, that the earth was flat and immovable; the sun, planets, and stars all being formed to be attendants on this globe for the use of man.

Time, however, advanced; science dawned upon the world in defiance of monkish ignorance, and printing was discovered. Facts began to be investigated, real knowledge in consequence to be introduced, and to escape by little and little among the multitude.

Thus commenced an opposition to religious ignorance, and it ad-

vanced against the efforts of the priesthood, aided even by the inquisition. Within the last two or three hundred years, knowledge has been disseminated in an extraordinary manner by the art of printing. This inestimable art has preserved to us so many important facts, derived from the experience of former times, that they serve in part to counteract the vicious circumstances which have been generated by the doctrine of free will, and all the religious notions founded on it. It is the knowledge derived from recorded experience, and the errors generated by the notion of free will, combating and counteracting each other, that has placed you in your present medium scale of character.

It is the religions over the earth, emanating directly from the unsubstantial notions derived from the doctrines of free will, and their necessary consequences in forming the feelings, thoughts, and actions of men, that has formed the present medium character of the inhabitants of the civilized world.

And so long as these free-will notions can be taught and received in opposition to the daily increasing lights of experience, showing how the character of every individual is formed *for* him, you will remain in your present medium condition, and the inhabitants of the world will receive the same inferior character that those errors have hitherto impressed upon them. But I must proceed to the twelfth and last revealed law of our nature; revealed by facts alike to all nations and people, namely: "That the individual is made the most superior of his species, when his original organization has been compounded of the best proportions, of the best ingredients of which human nature is formed, and when the circumstances which surround him from his birth to death, are of a character to produce only superior impressions, or in other words, when the circumstances or laws, institutions and customs in which he is placed, are all in unison with his nature."

My friends, if in any past times as much had been done for human nature, as you have witnessed this day, in the free and open discussion in which we have been engaged, we should not now have to lament the ignorance in which we have all been kept by the accumulation of vicious circumstances, by which we and all mankind have been surrounded from birth; but upon this part of the subject it is now too late to enter into detail. Take, however, into your consideration, for a moment, the importance of the three last laws, and more particularly of this twelfth law. In this you will discover the certain, the infallible process, by which the most is to be made of human nature that can be made of it, by men of one generation acting upon the children of the rising generation.

We cannot, as I have explained to you, make an immediate change upon the existing organization of the infants of our race; though I have no doubt that the time will come, when very great improvements will be made in the organization at birth. In the present state of ignorance, and consequent prejudice, in which we are upon

this subject, we must turn our attention only to those circumstances upon which the knowledge of the influence of circumstances will enable us to act. It has been well observed by one of our learned moderators, upon another occasion, in writing upon my views, that he did not well understand how human nature could be the creature of circumstances, and yet have the power to direct them. It was an intelligent view of the subject. The difficulty is to be explained, and overcome like all other difficulties when they occur, by proceeding in our investigations until the whole truth is discovered. By this process it becomes evident, that until we ascertain the fact that we are the creatures of circumstances, we are without the knowledge requisite to give us power to remove, replace, rearrange, and control them. And as soon as the knowledge of this fact is fully developed, it becomes itself a new circumstance, by which the existing adults may do more for the rising generations, than has been yet done for man through all past ages. This, my friends, is therefore the first, pre-eminently the first of sciences; it is one of the very highest order that the human mind can conceive. It is that science, by which, in due time, the men of one generation shall be enabled so far to improve the original organization at birth; the disposition, habits, manners, thoughts feelings, and conduct, after birth, of the succeeding generation, that the former shall become to the latter as creators. For they will be, through this new knowledge, enabled to give to the *new* man such superior faculties, thoughts, feelings, and dispositions, that it will appear to be a recreation; a regeneration; a new birth; a new life; a resurrection from the corruptions and abominations of the present irrational existence, into a state of peace, knowledge, and joy unspeakable! It is therefore a science so deeply interesting to all, that all, without delay, should be carefully taught it from the first dawning of their reason. And it is moreover a science so congenial to all the principles of nature, and the facts which exist around us, and through all nature, that little children may very easily and very early be instructed in it.

I perceive my hour is about to expire, and it is come when I have just entered upon the most interesting part of the discussion; but I submit to the wishes and convenience of others, and therefore, after I sit down, I shall not trespass on your time, unless it be for the sake of some explanation.

But I cannot take leave of you without expressing a strong sense of obligation to those gentlemen, who compose the committee for making the preliminary arrangements for this discussion; also to those gentlemen who have taken the trouble to attend to all the subsequent arrangements, and especially to the trustees of this building, who, with great urbanity, after one church was refused to the committee who applied for it, conceded to them the use of this for our purpose. And I am much indebted to all who have attended here during the discussion, for the extreme good order which has prevailed, and the remarkable good temper with which you have

received those strong, and, in many cases, highly exciting truths to christians, which I deem it my duty, with reference to future consequences, to place before you. I do not believe that on this account I can ever forget Cincinnati. It is true, I once prophesied her depopulation, not because I considered her any worse than other populous places, or a second Sodom and Gomorrah, for your conduct on this occasion proves the reverse. I was, it seems, mistaken, as to the precise time; having been misled at that period by the enthusiasm expressed by so many of its inhabitants in favor of principles which, to my pecuniary loss, I afterward discovered they so little understood. I was as well aware then, as I am now, that the inhabitants of a new and uneducated country, as this was at that time, were of necessity far more powerfully influenced by immediate impressions, than by extended and deep reflections. As surely, however, as these twelve fundamental laws are derived from facts which change not, so surely will the dispersion of the inhabitants of all large cities take place. You will, through this new knowledge, discover, erelong, that a large city is a collection of many injurious and vicious circumstances; too unfavorable to the highest happiness that human nature is capable of attaining, to be much longer allowed to remain. You cannot, under any arrangement, in populous cities, enjoy, in any perfection, the many important advantages, which are inseparable from the country, properly cultivated and well laid out for convenience, beauty, and pleasure, and to have at the same time, a full share of the best society. These essential requisitions to the enjoyment of life, cannot be obtained by a single human being within a large city, or in a single family, or among a few families in the country, while it is practicable to form an association of such numbers and character as, when properly arranged and constituted, will possess and enjoy all the advantages of city and country, without any of the numerous inconveniences, disadvantages, or evils of either. It was a mistake of my friend, Mr. C., for whom, after all our hard and sharp wordy battles, I am obliged to have the kindest feelings on account of his honesty and liberality, to suppose that my ideas of a social system were derived from the Shaking Quakers, Moravians, or any other existing prototype. My ideas upon this subject proceeded from a different source. At the time the embryo of these ideas first presented itself to my mind, I was unconscious that there was a single community living wholly upon public property, in existence. The first mature thoughts upon this subject were suggested to me by a profound consideration of the laws of our nature, and the effects which they were calculated to produce in practice, with the actual condition of mankind; I perceived that man existed in all conditions from a state of single and detrimental solitude through all stages of increasing numbers, up to a congregated mass, as in the capital of China, of two millions of human beings of all ages; but I did not then know that there was a number between these extremes, which, under proper management,

would give the greatest amount of happiness that man could enjoy. The discovery of this happy number and arrangement, is the first problem to be demonstrated in the science of political economy; and until these points shall be established upon rational principles, and derived from facts and experience, little of the science of political economy, as a science, can be known. These points are the data on which alone the science can take its rise, and without a knowledge of which no such science can be formed. The difficulty which presented itself to me at the outset of studying political economy, was to discover these data. Books written by speculative men in their closets, I soon ascertained could give me no information upon the subject. I had afterward an opportunity of observing the effects of a gradual increasing population, from a few families until they amounted to about twenty-five hundred souls, and then I discovered that the true minimum and maximum had been passed. It was thus I was enabled by experience to ascertain what was the extent of numbers, between which, a population could be arranged and congregated together, to give to each individual the greatest amount of advantages with the fewest inconveniences. I am now convinced from this experience, and from a very extensive and careful investigation of the business and concerns of human life, taking also into consideration the ascertained fixed laws of human nature, that the best medium number, ranges between eight hundred and twelve hundred, and that all associations of men, when they become rational, will be composed of congregations never descending below five hundred, nor ascending above two thousand.

These were the facts, principles and considerations whence my ideas of the social communities originated, and these are the causes which have impelled me so strongly to advocate them upon former, as well as upon the present occasion—they were not, therefore, derived from any of the prototypes, or contracted views and sources whence Mr. C. apprehends them to have originated. And it is from these sources, such as I have now explained them, that I predicted the depopulation of Cincinnati, that I still confidently anticipate a change in society from large and populous cities, and single families, to such associations, as will give to each individual the greatest advantages, with the fewest inconveniences.

I shall merely say, in conclusion, that the social system, as it exists in my mind, is an arrangement of society, founded on the most opposite principles, except in unity of labor and property, to the Shakers, Moravians, and old Harmonites, that can well be imagined. These are all founded on the ignorance and subjugation of the mass under a few intelligent privileged leaders—but which, nevertheless, produce much comfort, peace, and quiet happiness among that mass. They still, however, retain several of the practical errors, emanating from free-will doctrines, and frequently suffer changes and evils in consequence; and while those errors are retained, evils will continually occur, and there will be no stability among them. The

social system which I contemplate, is founded upon other principles, so different in character that each child will receive from infancy to maturity the best training, education, and instruction, that can be given to it. There will be no inequality of rank or condition, except what age and experience necessarily produce; and these of course, in due time, all will equally enjoy. And the code of laws, founded on the laws of our nature, will, under the administration explained in the second part of this work, equally direct and govern all, from the youngest to the most advanced in age and privileges attendant thereon.

Time does not permit me to add more. I therefore take my leave with the best feelings toward you all, wishing you health, continued prosperity, and the benefit of these anticipated improvements for your children. *

MR. CAMPBELL'S TWENTY-FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. Owen, in his last address, has given in his own experience, a refutation of his whole system. He has affirmed, that the circumstances which surrounded him did not first originate the idea of the social system. If so, then circumstances have not an absolute control over men. If Mr. Owen, in defiance of the power of circumstances, did, out of the rubbish of six thousand years, dig up the *twelve gems*, and originate the social system, why may not millions of as bright geniuses arise, superior to the circumstances that surround them, and originate new ideas and discover new laws, subversive of all former lights, knowledge, and experience? But how Mr. Owen may reconcile what he now said concerning the origination of the social system, and that spoken on a former occasion, I pause not now to inquire.

This assembly is now witness that I sat down, that Mr. Owen might defend his sixth law, if he could; and that he did not make a single effort. 'Tis true, indeed, he called upon me to produce some case as an example, where belief depended upon volition. He said I *could* not give any. He might, with a regard to truth, have said, I *did not* give any; but unless he knew my thoughts I cannot see on what grounds he could say, I *could* not give any. We will, however, try.

There was one Col. Sharp, of Frankfort, Kentucky, that was some time since assassinated by one Jeremiah O. Beauchamp. For some time no person knew who the perpetrator of this foulest of deeds was. No person as yet *believed* that Jeremiah O. Beauchamp was the assassin. But indignation, duty, interest, and curiosity, put all upon the inquiry. Every one is resolved, determines, or, if you

* Mr. Owen's speeches, delivered on Monday and Tuesday, are not printed from the *Stenographer's Report*, but from Mr. Owen's own publication of them. As they are somewhat improved in his publication, I preferred giving them in the best possible form. This will explain the words inclosed in brackets.

please, puts forth a volition, or wills to search for evidences to produce faith. Every trace, every whisper, and every circumstance, are explored, until a chain of evidence, so powerful, and so minute, is accumulated as authorizes a jury, under the most solemn sanctions of law and religion, to bring in a verdict of guilty. Every person, here, believed that Jeremiah O. Beauchamp was the assassin. Now the question is, *Had not the volition or determination of many individuals*, in this case, *some influence* upon their beliefs; or, in other words, did not the obtaining of the evidences necessary to conviction, *depend upon the volitions* of those concerned in tracing up the matter? I hope Mr. Owen will no more assert "That our faith, *in no case*, depends upon our volitions."

But am I not warranted in saying, that Mr. Owen has closed this discussion without even an attempt to prove *four* of his positions? He had *five* independent positions. Now to prove these *five* required a special induction of reasons, arguments, and proofs, with a direct bearing upon each of them; but this has not been attempted. He relied upon the repetition of his twelve laws, and upon his comments upon the same twelve, to prove the whole five—as if *identical* propositions. This may pass for logic among skeptics, but cannot among christians.

But, as night with its sable wings is fast embracing us, I must hasten. I had intended to have presented you with a correct and concentrated view of the whole of my arguments; but this would occupy too much time. I can only, therefore, with any regard to your patience and circumstances, just state the principal topics from which we argued the Divine authority of our holy religion.

Finding, as I soon did, after our commencement, that Mr. Owen had no idea of adducing any logical proof of his propositions, but that he was about to indulge in a latitude of declamation on his social system, and other matters and things having no logical connection with the points at issue, and after various fruitless efforts on my part, and on that of the Board of Moderators, to draw his attention to the real merits of the discussion, I proceeded to examine the ancient and modern systems of skepticism, for the purpose of proving this important point; that, so soon as men called philosophers, sages, or what you please, rejected revelation, and embarked on board of their own reason, they were, to a man, shipwrecked. Not one of them ever reached a safe haven, and such of them as were not wrecked upon some latent rock, foundered at sea. Nothing but contradiction among themselves; new mysteries, and *universal doubt* attended their progress. And, in fact, the most irrational and absurd opinions uniformly forced themselves into their minds, so soon as they had emptied themselves of all biblical ideas.

Mr. Owen told us that we must have a separate religion for each individual, because of the difference in human organization, not seeing, that upon the same principles, he must have a different social

system for each individual, and that no two skeptics who had ever written, agreed upon any one *system of doubting*. Even Mr. Owen himself, has made a new system, or, at least, has new modified several old ones, to please himself. Thus we have seen the intellectual aberrations, and the moral tendencies of all the systems of doubting. As I presume the new sects in christendom, will, by their rapid increase and geometrical progression, soon fritter themselves down to nothing; in other terms, the multiplication of *isms* will make them all of none effect, and teach all christians the necessity of making *facts*, and not *opinions*, the basis of all church union; so the impossibility of any two skeptics projecting anything like a system in which they can agree, has made it a forlorn hope for skeptics ever to rise higher than to a system of doubting.

After carrying the war into the enemy's country, and exploring the weakness of his fortresses, and the poverty of his resources, our next object was to erect an impassable wall between his dominions and ours, by showing *philosophically* that man could never have invented any religion, not even the most rude; that all these were mere *corruptions*, not *inventions* of the ancient nations. That, in truth, the most barbarous superstitions upon the earth, have in them *supernatural ideas*, which no mere man ever could have originated. In one sentence, I think we may say, it was proved, that it is as far beyond our intellectual powers to originate a religion of any sort, as it is beyond our physical powers, to create out of nothing, a stone or a tree. Our *third* item, or distinct chapter of arguments, was the establishment of the Divine legation of Moses, and the certain divine origin of the Jews' religion, proved by all *the criteria* of Leslie, which establish the truth of ancient facts, from the symbols of that religion, and the archives of all the ancient nations of the world. Our *fourth* chapter contained the *historic evidences* of the christian religion: our *fyth*, the prophetic denunciations of both testaments; the *sixth*, the genius and tendency of the christian religion; and the *seventh*, the social system. These were the great chapters of this discussion; though much incommoded, disturbed, and broken in upon, by the obliquity of Mr. Owen's course. Still, I flatter myself, when the whole is comprised together in one volume, it will prove, at least, that no christian has any reason to blush, or be ashamed of the foundation of his hope, or of his religion. Nay, more; that the christian religion is most certainly the institution of him who built the universe, and gave to man his dominion over the animal, the vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. That it is as clearly the work of an infinite understanding as the sun is the work of an almighty hand.

Before closing this my last address to you, my respected auditors, I beg leave to read you two extracts from my Christian Baptist, Vol. V, page 257. These remarks, though written a year ago, seem to me every way suited to the present occasion. The first is entitled the *Triumphs of Skepticism*; the second, the *Triumphs of Christianity*.

THE TRIUMPHS OF SKEPTICISM.

When skepticism triumphs in any heart, the hope of immortality is banished. It crowns the tyrant Death forever on his throne, and seals the conquests of the grave over the whole human race. It wraps the tomb in eternal darkness, and suffers not one particle of the remains of the great, the wise, and the good of all ages, to see the light of eternity, but consigns, by an irreversible doom, all that was admired, loved, and revered in man, to perpetual annihilation. It identifies human existence with the vilest reptile, and levels man to the grade of the meanest weed, whose utility is yet undiscovered. Man's origin and his destiny are to its ken alike fortuitous, unimportant, and uninteresting. Having robbed him of everything which could make him dear to himself and proud of his existence, it murders all his hopes of future being and future bliss. It cuts the cable and casts away the golden anchor; it sets man adrift on the mighty, unfathomable, and unexplored ocean of uncertainty, to become the sport of the wind and waves of animal passion and appetite; until, at last, in some tremendous gust, "he sinks to everlasting ruin." Say, then, proud reasoner, of what utility is your philosophy? What your boast?

You boast that you have made man ignorant of his origin and a stranger to himself. You boast that you have deprived him of any real superiority over the bee, the bat, or the beaver; that you have divested him of the highest inducements to a virtuous life, by taking away the knowledge of God and the hope of heaven. You boast that you have made Death triumphant, not only over the body, but the intellectual dignity of man; and that you have buried his soul and body in the grave of an eternal sleep, never to see the light of life again! O Skepticism! is this thy philosophy—is this thy boasted victory over the Bible? And for this extinguishment of light and life eternal, what dost thou teach and what bestow? Thou teachest us to live according to our appetites, and dost promise us that in thy Millennium man shall live in a Paradise of colonies, almost as industrious, as independent, and as social as the bees. Well then dost thou preach with zeal, and exert thy energies; for thy heaven is worthy of thy efforts, and the purity of thy life is just adapted to the high hopes of eternal annihilation.

THE TRIUMPHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

A true believer and practitioner of the christian religion, is completely and perfectly divested of a guilty conscience, and the consequent fear of death. The very end and intention of God's being manifest in the flesh, in the person of Jesus our Savior, was to deliver them, "who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to slavery." Jesus has done this. He has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light. He has given strength to his disciples to vanquish death, and make them triumph over the grave; so that a living or a dying christian can with truth say, "O Death, where now

thy sting! O Grave, where now thy victory!" He conquered both, and by faith in him we conquer both. This is the greatest victory ever was obtained. To see a christian conquer him who had for ages conquered all, is the sublimest scene ever witnessed by human eyes. And this may be seen as often as we see a true christian die. I know that a perverted system of christianity inspires its votaries with the fear of death, because it makes doubts and fears christian virtues. But this religion is not of God. His Son died that we might not fear to die; and he went down to the grave to show us the path up to life again, and thus to make us victorious over the king of tyrants, and the tyrant over kings. They understand not his religion, who are not triumphant over those guilty fears. The guilty only can fear, and the guilty are not acquainted with the character, mission, and achievements of Jesus our life. No one taught of God can fear these horrors of the wicked. Jesus Christ made no covenant with death; he signed no articles of capitulation with the horrible destroyer. He took his armor away, he bound him in an invincible chain, and taught him only to open the door of immortality to all his friends.

A christian, then, must triumph and always rejoice. Our gloomy systems say, Rejoice not always, but afflict your souls: whereas the Apostles say, Rejoice in the Lord always; and again we say, Rejoice. The gospel, as defined by the angels of God, is, GLAD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY; and who can believe GLAD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, and not rejoice? Deists, Atheists, and the whole host of skeptics may *doubt*, for this is their whole system; the wicked, the guilty, and the vile may *fear*, for this is the natural issue of their lives; but how a christian, knowing the Lord, believing the promises, and confiding in the achievements of the Savior, can doubt or fear as respects death or the grave, is inconceivable. Thanks be to God who gives us the victory!

Some persons may doubt whether they are christians; and some may fear the pain of dying as they would the toothache, or a dislocated joint; but that a christian should fear either death or the grave, is out of character altogether. For this is the very drift, scope, and end of his religion. They who are under the influence of such fears and doubts, have much reason to fear and doubt whether ever they have known or believed the truth, the gospel of salvation. But a christian in fact, or one who deserves the name, is made to rejoice and triumph in the prospects of death and the grave. And why? Because his Lord has gone before him—because his rest, his home, his eternal friends and associates, his heaven, his God, all his joys are beyond the grave. Not to know this, is to be ignorant of the favor of God; not to believe this, is to doubt the philanthropy of God; not to rejoice in this, is to reject the gospel, and to judge ourselves unworthy of eternal life. But the christian religion is not to be reproached because of the ignorance or unbelief of those who profess it. All rivers do not more naturally run down the declivities

and wind their courses to the ocean, than the christian religion leads its followers to the sure, and certain, and triumphant hopes of immortality.

Before we dismiss this assembly, I beg leave to express my sensibility, my admiration of the marked and courteous attention which has been paid by this community to this discussion. I must again repeat that I have never seen any assembly convened upon any occasion which has all through exhibited the same good order, the same complaisant behavior, and the same unremitted attention. I feel indebted to, and will ever feel a high respect for, the citizens of this city, for the favorable circumstances which they have created for this debate; and especially to the gentlemen who have so politely and so patiently presided over this meeting.

But I should be wanting to you my friends, and the cause which I plead, if I should dismiss you without making to you a very important proposition. You know that this discussion is matter for the press. You know that every encomium that has been pronounced upon your exemplary behavior, will go with the report of this discussion. You will remember, too, that many indignities have been offered to your faith, to your religion, and that these reproaches and indignities have been only heard with pity and not marked with the least resentment on your part. Now I must tell you that a problem will arise in the minds of those living five hundred or a thousand miles distant, who may read this discussion, *whether it was owing to a perfect apathy or indifference on your part, as to any interest you felt in the christian religion, that you bore all these insults without seeming to hear them.* In fine, the question will be, *whether it was owing to the stoical indifference of fatalism, to the prevalence of infidelity; or, to the meekness and forbearance which christianity teaches, that you bore all these indignities without a single expression of disgust.* Now I desire no more than that this good and christian like deportment may be credited to the proper account. If it be owing to your concurrence in sentiment with Mr. Owen, let skepticism have the honor of it. But if owing to your belief in, or regard for, the christian religion, let the christian religion have the honor of it. These things premised, my proposition is *that all the persons in this assembly who believe in the christian religion or who feel so much interest in it, as to wish to see it pervade the world, will please to signify it by standing up.* [An almost universal rising up.]

Here Mr. Campbell says, You will have the goodness to be seated.

Now I would further propose, *that all persons doubtful of the truth of the christian religion, or who do not believe it, and who are not friendly to its spread and prevalence over the world, will please signify it by rising up.* [THREE ARISE.]

Mr. OWEN rises.

Gentlemen moderators—It has just occurred to me that I had forgotten to tender my thanks to you for your presence and superintendence on this occasion, which I now beg leave to do. And I may add, I am much pleased with Mr. Campbell's little maneuver of the test, because I discover it pleases him and his friends. Truth requires no such support. [*Candles called for.*]

Mr. CAMPBELL rises.

While we are waiting for light, I will move that the thanks of this whole assembly be presented to the Board of Moderators, and put upon record.—*Nemine contradicente.*

Adjournment *sine die.*

CHARLES HOWARD SIMMS, *Reporter.*

THE END.